

Central and Eastern Berkshire

Joint Minerals and Waste Plan

Issues and Options Consultation - Response Form

The Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities (Bracknell Forest Council, Reading Borough Council, The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead and Wokingham Borough Council) are working in partnership to produce a Joint Minerals and Waste Plan which will guide minerals and waste decision making in the Plan area up until 2036.

The Joint Minerals & Waste Plan will build upon the formerly adopted minerals and waste plans for the Berkshire area, and improve, update and strengthen the policies and provide details of strategic sites that are proposed to deliver the vision.

The first stage in plan-preparation is known as the 'Issues and Options' Consultation and runs between 9 June 2017 and 21 July 2017. The purpose of this consultation is to engage the community in discussion on the **Issues** for managing minerals and waste for the next 20 years. It is also an opportunity to gather more evidence to inform the **Options** for the plan policies and site allocations.

The questions in this response form refer to the Issues and Options document. Further information, details and other documents related to the Issues and Options Consultation can be found via www.hants.gov.uk/berksconsult, where you can also find the on-line version of this survey.



www.rbwm.gov.uk



This document is split into several sections. Please answer as many questions as you can. You can answer questions on just one section or all of them, and you may wish to miss out any questions you feel unable to answer.

The sections are as follows:

The sections are as follows:

- Personal details (page 3)
- Plan direction (page 5)
- Minerals (page 6)
- Waste (page 18)
- Equalities information (page 27)

Once completed, please return copies of this response form by **5pm on 21 July 2017** to:

Hampshire Services
Strategic Planning
Elizabeth II Court West
The Castle
Winchester
SO23 8UD

Or via email to Berks.Consult@hants.gov.uk

Personal details

First name (<i>required field</i>)	Martin
Surname (<i>required field</i>)	Ott
Your address	Savills (UK) Ltd 136 New London Road Chelmsford Essex CM2 0RG
Your email address	
Your organisation (if applicable)	Savills UK Ltd

Respondent capacity (please tick as appropriate)

Resident	
Local Business	
Minerals and Waste Industry	
Parish Council	
District Council	
County or Parish Councillor	
Other (please specify in the right hand column)	Acting as agent on behalf of the Rayner Family Trust, Berkyn Manor Farm, Stanwell Road, Horton, SL3 9PE

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) (*required field*)

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Data Protection Statement

This survey is being carried out by Hampshire Services on behalf of Bracknell Forest Council, Reading Borough Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead and Wokingham Borough Council (collectively referred to as the 'Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities'). All of these individual authorities are registered with the Information Commissioner's Office.

The information you have provided in this questionnaire will be used for the purposes of the consultation and will not be used for any other purpose. All individuals' responses will be kept confidential and will only be shared with the Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities.

All documents and redacted representations can be viewed by appointment or may be published online and will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Multiple Recipients Guidance

If you are a consultee for one or more of the Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities you may have received multiple invitations to respond to the consultation. Please note that only one response from each organisation is necessary unless different parts of the organisation wish to respond on different matters.

Alternative Format Statement

A summary of this document can be made available in large print, in Braille or audio cassette. Copies in other languages may also be obtained. Please contact Hampshire Services by email berks.consult@hants.gov.uk or by calling 01962 845785.

Section 1 - Plan Direction

The Vision and strategy for the Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities Joint Minerals & Waste Plan ('The Plan')

Q1 Do you agree with the proposed Plan period up to 2036?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q2 If not, what period do you suggest and why?

--

Q3 Do you agree with the proposed Vision?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q4 If not, what changes would you suggest?

--

Q5 Do you agree with the proposed Strategic Plan Objectives?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Q6 If not, what changes would you suggest?

There needs to be a greater emphasis on the need to supply the construction industry with sufficient primary aggregate to support sustainable economic growth.

It should also be recognised that there is a requirement to dispose of inert waste which has been no other economic value. It also facilitates quarry restoration and enables beneficial after use.

Q7 Do you agree with the proposed Spatial Strategy Content?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Q8 If not, what changes would you suggest?

See answer to Q6

Section 2 – Minerals

There are 20 identified issues to the minerals chapter of this survey. You can answer all questions or you can select particular issues to answer. The issues are as follows:

- Minerals data
- Transportation of minerals
- Aggregate demand
- Aggregate supply
- Recycled and secondary aggregate
- Crushed rock
- Marine won sand and gravel
- Sand and gravel markets
- Extraction locations
- Sand and gravel resources
- Sand and gravel imports / exports
- Past sand and gravel sales
- Soft sand
- Landbank
- Future sand and gravel provision
- Mineral safeguarding
- Clay
- Chalk
- Oil and gas
- Coal

Minerals Data

Issue: Historic minerals data has, hitherto, been largely collected and published on a Berkshire wide scale. This has necessitated interpretation and judgement of the information to reach an understanding of the Central and Eastern Berkshire mineral situation.

Q9 Can you suggest any other sources of minerals data for the Central and Eastern Berkshire area?

The Rayner Family Trust is keen to encourage openness in respect of mineral output and inert landfill input to assist in proper forward planning.

Q10 Do you agree that the general trends for the Berkshire wide level of mineral demand are also likely to apply in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	✓ - Due to greater economic activity, demand for sand and gravel in Central and Eastern Berkshire will be higher than in West Berkshire.

Q11 Do you agree that there is sufficient information to support a minerals plan for Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	✓
No	

Transportation of minerals

Issue: the lack of rail depot and water freight capabilities means that all mineral movements within Central and Eastern Berkshire are by road. This also creates a dependency on rail depots in neighbouring authorities.

Q12 Do you have any information that could help to inform the understanding on mineral movements within Central and Eastern Berkshire, as well as imports / exports of minerals, into and outside of The Plan area?

The Rayner Family Trust is keen to encourage openness in respect of mineral output and inert landfill input to assist in proper forward planning.

Q13 Do you think potential and practicable rail and water connected sites should be identified within Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q14 Do you know of any such sites within Central and Eastern Berkshire?

No

Q15 If existing rail depots in neighbouring authorities cannot be retained should The Plan encourage their replacement?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Aggregate demand

Issue: there are a significant number of national and locally significant construction projects within and in proximity to Central and Eastern Berkshire which will require a steady and adequate supply of aggregate over and beyond The Plan period. Redevelopment projects will provide a source of recycled aggregate through construction and demolition material.

Q16 Do you know of any other local data that should be used to forecast local demand for aggregate?

The Rayner Family Trust encourage openness in respect of mineral output and inert landfill inputs to assist in proper forward planning.

Q17 Do you agree that the demand information suggests that there will be a continued and possible increase in minerals demand in the near future or later in The Plan period?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Aggregate supply

Issue: both marine won sand and gravel and crushed rock, which are both imported into Berkshire, are likely to continue to increase in importance in aggregate supply for Central and Eastern Berkshire.

Q18 Do you think it is fair to assume that the trends of increasing dependence of imported aggregate in Berkshire is reflected in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Q19 If not, what information do you have that would support this?

National Planning Policy Framework guidance states that MPA's should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and make provision for a landbank of at least 7 years.

Q20 Do you agree that the trend for increasing consumption of crushed rock and marine sand and gravel, heighten the dependence of Central and Eastern Berkshire on the rail depots in neighbouring authorities?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Recycled and secondary aggregate

Issue: the use of recycled and secondary aggregate is increasing nationally. There is a significant amount of development and redevelopment planned within The Plan area which can be both a source and a market for the material.

Q21 Are you aware of any other sources of information on aggregate recycled or secondary aggregate data which can be reported on?

The Rayner Family Trust is keen to encourage openness in respect of mineral output and inert landfill input to assist in proper forward planning.

Q22 Do you agree with the assumption that Central and Eastern Berkshire is exporting some of its construction and demolition waste outside of The Plan area, potentially to West Berkshire, for processing?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q23 Do you agree that Central and Eastern Berkshire should be more self sufficient in its processing of construction and demolition waste within The Plan area?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Crushed rock

Issue: Central and Eastern Berkshire is reliant on the importation of crushed rock from Somerset via the rail depots in West Berkshire and Slough.

Q24 Do you agree with the assumption that the crushed rock supplied to Central and Eastern Berkshire is sourced from Somerset via the rail depots at Theale?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q25 Do you agree that the consumption of crushed rock within the Berkshire area demonstrates the dependence of Central and Eastern Berkshire on the rail depots in neighbouring areas as sources of supply?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Marine-won sand and gravel

Issue: marine sand and gravel forms part of the aggregate supply provision for Central and Eastern Berkshire. It is likely that this material is being supplied by road from Hampshire's wharves and via the rail depots in West Berkshire and Slough from London's wharves.

Q26 Do you agree with the assumption that the marine won sand and gravel forms a small but important part of the aggregate supply to Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q27 Do you agree with the assumption that marine won sand and gravel from Hampshire is being transported by road and via rail from London's wharves?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q28 Do you agree that the import of marine aggregates to Central and Eastern Berkshire justifies support for safeguarding wharves in supply locations such as Hampshire and London?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Sand and gravel markets

Issue: the principle market for sand and gravel produced in Central and Eastern Berkshire is likely its urban areas and those in neighbouring parts of the Thames Valley.

Q29 Do you agree that the main markets for sand and gravel are within Central and Eastern Berkshire and neighbouring areas of the Thames Valley?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Extraction locations

Issue: there is only one permitted soft sand site within Central and Eastern Berkshire and this is currently inactive so this material is likely to be sourced elsewhere.

Q30 Do you agree that the supply of soft sand to Central and Eastern Berkshire is being sourced from outside The Plan area?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q31 Are you aware of any reasons for soft sand proposals not coming forward?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q32 Are you aware of any potential soft sand sites?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Issue: there are approximately seven million tonnes of permitted reserves within Central and Eastern Berkshire. There have been no operational sites within the Borough of Slough for 10 years which means they have been dependent on alternative sources of supply.

Q33 Do you agree with the assumption that Central and Eastern Berkshire is likely to be supplying Slough with aggregate?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q34 Are you aware of any factors which may affect the estimated seven million tonnes of reserves at operational sites within Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Sand and gravel resources

Issue: there are approximately seven million tonnes of permitted reserves within Central and Eastern Berkshire. Other potential reserves are likely to be identified within Wokingham and Windsor & Maidenhead Boroughs. There are also reserves in Preferred Areas but some of these are located within Slough Borough Council's administrative area.

Q35 Do you agree that potential resources of sand and gravel and soft sand remain within Windsor & Maidenhead and Wokingham Boroughs'?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q36 Do you think the resources in Preferred Areas in Slough should be taken account of when considering potential resources supply to Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Sand and gravel imports / exports

Issue: approximately half of the land won sand and gravel consumed within Berkshire is sourced from within Berkshire and imports by road from Hampshire are an important alternative source.

Q37 Do you agree that the main supplies of sand and gravel used in the area are from within Berkshire and Hampshire?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q38 If not, do you have any evidence to support this?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q39 Do you agree with the assumption that a decline in exports reflects the development demand pressures within the area?

Yes	
No	✓ This is more likely to be the exhaustion of existing reserves within the area.
Don't Know	

Q40 Do you agree with the assumption that imports and exports of sand and gravel are transported by road?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Past sand and gravel sales

Issue: West Berkshire has collated the most reliable source of data on sales figures and contribution to the Berkshire total sales figures and therefore, Central and Eastern Berkshire will also use these figures

Q41 Do you have any available data that could be used to inform the sales information for Central and Eastern Berkshire?

The Rayner Family Trust is keen to encourage openness in respect of mineral output and inert landfill input in order to assist in proper forward planning.

Issue: based on the future aggregate demand information, the three year average figure of 752,765 tonnes per annum is likely to reflect the future aggregate demand for Central and Eastern Berkshire as well as the wider Thames Valley.

Q42 Do you agree that the three year average is a true reflection of demand for Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	✓ - A three year average is a better reflection of demand in Central and Eastern Berkshire but supply is constrained and demand is likely to be far higher than this and will continue to grow.
Don't Know	

Q43 If not, what level of demand do you think is appropriate to forecast future demand and what evidence do you have to support this?

Soft sand

Issue: there is currently no soft sand produced in Central and Eastern Berkshire and soft sand is being imported.

Q44 Due to the lack of soft sand sales from quarries within Central and Eastern Berkshire, what do you estimate is the level of demand for soft sand in the area and what evidence do you have to support this?

Q45 Do you think that Central and Eastern Berkshire should continue to rely solely on imports of soft sand?

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Q 46 If not, what measures can be used to encourage soft sand proposals to come forward?

Identify areas of search for soft sand in the new mineral local plan.

Landbank

Issue: the landbank based on three year sales for sand and gravel in Central and Eastern Berkshire is 8.8 years.

Q47 Do you agree that the landbank of 8.8 years for Central and Eastern Berkshire is a more accurate reflection of supply?

Yes	
No	✓ - A landbank of 8.8 years is a better reflection of supply but historic output has been constrained by the limited number of sites and processing plants within

	Central and Eastern Berkshire. Demand is likely to be considerably higher than supply.
Don't Know	

Q48 If not, what factors or information influence your position?

--

Future sand and gravel provision

Issue: there is a requirement for additional reserves of between 4,267,981 and 9,140,065 tonnes of sand and gravel during The Plan period.

Q49 Do you agree that the Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities should plan for an additional requirement of 9 million tonnes of sand and gravel?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q50 If not, what is the evidence to support this?

Demand for sand and gravel in Central and Eastern Berkshire is likely to grow in order to supply construction material for built development. The additional requirement of 9 million tonnes should be considered the absolute minimum and some flexibility should be built into the plan to allow additional sites to come forward during the plan period.
--

Issue: the existing Preferred Areas from the saved Replacement Minerals Local Plan do not fully meet the future demand and some of the sites are located outside The Plan area.

Q51 Do you agree that all the remaining Preferred Areas are reconsidered for inclusion in the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q52 Do you have any information regarding the remaining Preferred Areas which may impact their inclusion?

Yes	<p>✓ - Preferred Area 12 (North of Horton) has been omitted as a an existing preferred area from the Minerals Background Study. Berkyn Manor Farm was granted planning permission of the extraction of 800,000 tonnes of sand and gravel with restoration through the import of inert waste in July 2008, App Ref 04/01716. The permission was renewed in November 2011, App Ref 10/02804/FUL. The planning permission has lapsed but its status as a Preferred Area remains. The site will be the subject of a new planning application in 2017.</p>
No	
Don't Know	

Q53 Are you aware of any sand and gravel sites that could be proposed for extraction?

Yes	✓ - Please see answer to Q52
No	

Don't Know	
------------	--

Mineral safeguarding

Issue: it is considered necessary to safeguard proven mineral deposits of sharp sand and gravel and soft sand to prevent sterilisation and retain resources to meet longer term need.

Q54 Do you agree that only mineral deposits of sharp sand and gravel and soft sand are safeguarded within Mineral Safeguarding Areas?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q55 If not, what other minerals should be included and why?

Clay

Issue: there is no current industrial demand for clay in the area and other demands are low.

Q56 Do you agree that it is not necessary to safeguard clay resources because current industrial demand by brick and tiles works is low in this area?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q57 If not, what evidence do you have to support this?

Q58 Do you agree that it is not necessary to allocate clay extraction sites?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q59 If not, what evidence do you have to support this?

Q60 Do you agree that future clay proposals can be judged against a criteria based policy?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Chalk

Issue: there is a low level of demand for chalk in Central and Eastern Berkshire.

Q61 Do you agree that it is not necessary to safeguard chalk resources?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q62 If not, what evidence do you have to support this?

--

Q63 Do you agree that it is not necessary to allocate chalk extraction sites?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q64 If not, what evidence do you have to support this?

--

Q65 Do you agree that future chalk proposals can be judged against a criteria based policy?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Oil and gas

Issue: there are currently no known commercially viable resources of oil and gas in Central and Eastern Berkshire and no existing licence areas.

Q66 Do you agree there are currently no known commercially viable resources of oil and gas in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q67 Do you agree that the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan should contain a policy to judge future oil and gas proposals should the situation change?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q68 Do you agree that a criteria based policy should be used to judge any future oil and gas proposals?

Yes	
No	

Don't Know	✓
------------	---

Coal

Issue: coal has not been addressed in minerals and waste planning policy previously

Q69 Do you agree that a criteria based policy should be used to judge any future coal proposals?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q70 If not, what evidence do you have to support this?

--

Section 2 - Waste Issues

There are 12 identified issues to the waste chapter of this survey. You can answer all the questions or you can select particular issues to answer. The issues are as follows:

- Waste data
- Estimating waste management capacity
- Non hazardous waste data
- Non hazardous waste management
- Inert waste data
- Inert waste management
- Hazardous waste data and management
- Specialist waste
- Future waste arisings
- Future waste capacity
- Locational requirements for waste facilities
- Transportation of waste

Waste Data

Issue: waste arisings data is difficult to source, but the Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator provides a relatively comprehensive and consistent source of data.

Q71 Do you agree that the Environment Agency's Waste and Hazardous Waste Data Interrogators are the main, most up to date, and most robust sources of waste data available in England?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q72 Do you agree that the figures in Table 4 give an approximate idea of the level of both waste arisings and waste managed in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q73 Do you agree with the use of waste data, where the source is a Central and Eastern Berkshire Authority, as a proxy for waste arisings in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q74 Do you agree with the use of waste received at facilities in Central and Eastern Berkshire as a proxy for the waste management capacity within Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q75 Are there other waste streams and waste data sources not dealt with in this report?

--

Estimating waste management capacity

Issue: there is no comprehensive source of data on waste capacity.

Q76 Do you agree with the methodology for estimating capacity proposed in Table 5?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q77 Are there any other sources of capacity data that you would suggest?

--

Q78 Is there another methodology for estimating waste capacity data that could be used?

--

Non-hazardous waste data

Issue: non hazardous waste arisings data can be sourced from different places, with different caveats and levels of reliability.

Q79 Do you think that non hazardous waste arisings should be estimated using Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator data, in combination with Waste Data Flow where required?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q80 Do you think that non hazardous waste arisings should be estimated using Waste Data Flow and Commercial & Industrial arisings models?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q81 Do you think that non hazardous waste arisings should be estimated using a combination of the above?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q82 Do you think that non hazardous waste arisings should be estimated using another method?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

If so, please specify what method and where the data should be sourced

--

Non-hazardous waste management

Issue: non hazardous waste is managed at a regional level and there is no self sufficiency within Central and Eastern Berkshire, particularly in terms of Energy from Waste and non hazardous landfill facilities.

Q83 Do you agree that the Colnbrook Energy from Waste facility is a vital strategic waste management facility for Central and Eastern Berkshire and Slough and so a replacement of the capacity within the area should be strongly supported?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q84 Do you agree that landfill is becoming a regional level waste management facility and that it is not always appropriate to seek to allocate local sites?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q85 Which of these approaches do you consider is the most reasonable in terms of waste management?:

A – continue to use existing waste management facilities network, even when they are in nearby counties	
B – seek to make full provision within Central and Eastern Berkshire for the waste management facilities that match the estimated waste arisings	✓
C – seek to make greater use of existing types capacity (e.g. of inert waste facilities, see below) and provide for net self sufficiency for waste	
D – continue to use the existing waste management facilities network, however, seek to make greater provision for facilities higher up the waste hierarchy and provide for net self sufficiency for waste	

Inert waste data

Issue: Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator data on inert waste is less robust than the non hazardous, but other sources of data may not necessarily be more comprehensive or robust.

Q86 Which of the following approaches do you think is the most reasonable to estimate arisings of inert waste?

A - use Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator data	
B - complement Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator with aggregate recycling monitoring data	
C - complement Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator and aggregate recycling data with estimates based on construction activity	✓
D - other method	

For other, please specify what method and where the data should be sourced

--

Inert waste management

Issue: inert landfill has different characteristics than non hazardous landfill so it may be useful to treat it differently.

Q87 Do you agree that inert landfill is significantly different to non hazardous landfill?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q88 Do you agree that there might be benefits to inert landfill beyond those operations that are classed as recovery?

Yes	✓ - To enable quarry restoration and the disposal of inert waste close to its source are both important considerations.
No	
Don't Know	

Hazardous waste data and management

Issue: hazardous waste is a highly specialist area and it is unlikely that The Plan will be able to provide all the facilities required for all the hazardous waste streams arising in The Plan area.

Q89 Which of the following options do you think is the most reasonable approach to managing hazardous waste?

A – continue the current patterns of hazardous waste management and provide a criteria based policy on which new proposals could be judged	
B – meet net self sufficiency through increased provision of waste management of other types of waste streams (non hazardous and inert)	
C – seek to provide greater capacity in the hazardous waste management facility types that are currently present, aiming for net self sufficiency in the hazardous waste stream	
D – seek to provide greater capacity and greater diversity of hazardous waste management facilities, aiming for net self sufficiency in the hazardous waste stream	

Q90 Can you suggest robust sources of data on hazardous waste facilities?

--

Q91 Can you suggest stakeholders that would have a particular interest in hazardous waste?

--

Specialist waste

Issue: there are many types of hazardous and specialist waste and data can often be hard to obtain.

Q92 Do you agree that we need to consider the specialist waste streams as listed in paragraph 10.22 of the Consultation Paper?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q93 Are there any other types of hazardous or specialist waste that arise or that are managed in facilities in Central and Eastern Berkshire and Slough?

--

Q94 Where else could we look for data on other types of hazardous or specialist waste?

--

Q95 Are there particular types of hazardous and specialist waste that we need to plan for and why?

--

Future waste arisings

Issue: there are a number of national and local development projects which will impact waste growth in Central and Eastern Berkshire.

Issue: waste arisings growth estimates need to work with a set of reasonable assumptions.

Q96 Should we use waste management changes in the past as a basis for predicting waste arisings in the future?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	

Q97 If yes, are trends over the past 10 years a good period of time to use?

Yes	
No	✓ - Trends over the last 3 years are likely to be more accurate.
Don't Know	

Q98 Should we weight waste arising predictions to take account of population and business growth predicted in the constituent authorities' emerging local plans?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q99 Should we use a range of scenarios including introducing a buffer of 15% above our estimates and 15% below our estimates to demonstrate the unpredictability of future waste arisings?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q100 Do you agree with the assumptions recommended for use in waste forecasting in the Planning Practice Guidance for waste?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q101 What other assumptions do you think we should use?

--

Q102 Do you agree with the use of low, medium and high waste growth scenario?

--

Q103 Do you have suggestions about what range of waste growth The Plan should consider, providing reasons and data sources?

--

Future waste capacity

Issue: waste scenarios offer a way of comparing different waste management planning options, but there are many possible scenarios not all of which can be explored.

Q104 Do you agree that we should use waste scenarios to explore waste management planning options?

Yes	✓
No	
Don't Know	

Q105 Do you agree with the four scenarios discussed in paragraph 10.26 of the Consultation Paper and that they cover the majority of options?

Yes	
No	
Don't Know	✓

Q106 If not, what scenarios would you suggest?

--

Locational requirements for waste facilities

Issue: there are many types of waste management facilities, with differing locational requirements

Q107 Do you agree with the seven broad categories of waste management facilities listed in paragraph 10.28 of the Consultation Paper as a useful way of grouping them by locational requirements?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q108 If not, what are your suggestions and why?

--

Q109 Do you have any comments on the particular planning considerations they may have?

--

Transportation of waste

Issue: Central and Eastern Berkshire is well connected by road and rail. It is assumed that all waste movements are undertaken by road due to the lack of any rail depot or wharf within The Plan area.

Q110 Do you agree with the assumption that all waste is currently transported by road in Central and Eastern Berkshire?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q111 Do you agree that it is unlikely that waste will be transported by water during The Plan period?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q112 If you disagree, please state where the transfer docks should be located

--

Q113 Do you agree that transportation of waste by rail should be encouraged, where possible?

C&EB JMWP Issues and Options Consultation Response Form

Yes	
No	✓
Don't Know	

Q114 If you agree, please state where the rail depot facilities should be located

Q115 What comments do you have on the: Minerals Background Study?

Please see answer to Q52

Q116 What comments do you have on the: Waste Background Study?

Preferred Area 25 (North of Horton) is a saved policy from the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998. The site continues to enjoy the status as a Preferred Area for inert waste disposal.

Q117 What comments do you have on the Site Methodology Assessment?

Q118 What comments do you have on the other Methodologies (Landscape, Transport and Industrial Estate Review)?

Q119 What comments do you have on the Equalities Impact Assessment?

