

**Issue 3 – Requirement for Sand and Gravel**

How should the Tees Valley meet the sub-regional requirement for sand and gravel as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy?

*Options*






- A. The Tees Valley's contribution to sand and gravel provision will continue to rely on the existing operations at North Gare;
- B. The resolution of the planning position at Stockton Quarry to allow it to continue production;
- C. The provision of further reserves through the allocation of additional sites and resources; or
- D. A combination approach which takes into account elements of the three options above.
- E. The requirement can be met by combining reserves with those in County Durham.

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	+	-	-	-/?	+	<p>On a Tees Valley level it is clear that sand and gravel primary extraction, the subject of this issue, will continue / increase if Options B-D are implemented. The ‘top tier’ of the minerals hierarchy is to reduce minerals used. By default, it is acknowledged that reducing the sand and gravel supply shall contribute towards increasing recycling, reuse and reduction of mineral usage on a inter Tees Valley level.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is clear that this aspect must be examined on a transboundary level and requirement for primary resources of sand and gravel will be met from sources outside of the Tees Valley if none are available locally, thus increasing transportation etc. To this extent only a negligibly positive scoring has been applied to options B – D and it is accepted that the role of squeezing supply is only likely to have a negligible effect on minerals usage in the short to medium term if carried out by the Tees Valley in isolation.</p> <p>Option D also scores relatively uncertainly given that it seeks a combination approach which, as yet, cannot be readily defined. Notwithstanding this, it still seeks to increase the extraction of sand and gravel within the Tees Valley.</p> <p>It is noted that option A must score positively given that it is based on a ‘naturally replenished supply of sand’ at the North Gare and therefore is deemed to be somewhat outside of the waste hierarchy model and is preferable over other extraction means of sand.</p> <p>Based on the arguments put forward, above, Option E also</p>

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
						performs well against this SA objective given that it will eliminate sand and gravel extraction in the Tees Valley thereby reducing supply / reliance on primary resources. It is however noted that the proximity of supplies in Durham and surrounding districts shall however marginalise these impacts in the short to medium term.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	++	+	+	+/?	-	Options A-D must all score positively as they are explicitly seeking to maximise the usages of local sand and gravel resources. Option A in particular scores significantly well given that it shall utilise a replenish-able source of sand which is deemed to be a sustainable use of this resource.  Option E does not use utilise local resources in the Tees Valley through the reliance on Durham County to meet requirements.
4. To ensure good air quality for all	+	+	+	+/?	-	It is considered that Options A – D all contribute towards reducing the need to transport primary minerals into the Tees Valley. Option E will increase reliance on the transboundary movements of materials thereby to the detriment of air quality.
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	--	X	X	-/?	X	It is considered that Options (A and D) that seek to continue the usage of the North Gare site has the potential to disturb costal waters, flows and hydrology significantly.  It is noted that extractions at the current level at North Gare are

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
						<p>the baseline situation and can be viewed as ‘protecting’ but not ‘enhancing’ coastal water quality.</p> <p>Options not relating to the North Gare extraction site are considered to have negligible relationship with this objective.</p> <p>Mitigation to control impact may be afforded at a project level.</p>
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region’s biodiversity and geodiversity	--	-	--	-/?	+	<p>It is considered that options A – D all have the potential to negatively effect biodiversity whether it be the current level of disruption or extending / enlarging extraction activities which may further harm. Option A in particular scores significantly negatively given the potential harm caused to marine ecosystems by long term dredging. It is noted that the coastal and fluvial areas of the Tees are some of the most biodiversity rich locations in the sub Region. Option C also scores significantly poorly given that it may encroach onto new un-disturbed sites that foster notable biodiversity.</p> <p>It must be noted that impact on biodiversity may be mitigated through the development control process.</p> <p>Option E must score positively on a Tees Valley level given that it will not create any further development / extractions. Obviously this would not apply on a transboundary level.</p>
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	--	-	--	-/?	+	<p>Similar to the comments noted above that the implementation of A – D will continue to effect urban and rural land and landscapes (including marine). Option C in particular scores significantly negatively as it carries potential to detrimentally effect further landscapes if extractions are increased.</p>

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
						landscapes if extractions are increased.  It is noted that mitigation on a project level may mitigate a number of detrimental impacts. Notwithstanding this, mitigation against the negative effects of marine dredging and sand piling.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	-	--	-/?	+	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	+	+	+	+/?	-	It is considered that Options A – D all contribute towards reducing the need to transport primary minerals into the Tees Valley. Option E will increase reliance on the transboundary movements of materials thereby to the detriment of air quality.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	+	+	++	+/?	-	Options A – D score well given that they will continue to support the extraction of sand and gravel industries and secondary users within the Tees Valley.  Option E will not contribute towards economic growth or retention within the Tees Valley and therefore scores negatively.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship

	Options					
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E	Comments / Mitigation
the sub region						
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	+	+	+	+/?	-	<p>It is considered that Options A – D all contribute towards reducing the need to transport primary minerals into the Tees Valley. Option E will increase reliance on the transboundary movements of materials.</p> <p>Mitigation and specific polices, whatever option is progressed, can contribute towards increasing choice of transport mode.</p>
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	+	+	+	+/?	-	<p>Access to sand and gravel resources within the Tees Valley will be retained or increased through the implementation of Options A – D.</p>
<b>Summary</b>	 Bad	 OK	 OK	 OK ???	 Bad	<p>Options B – D all scored relatively well as they seek to consolidate and potentially expand the sand and gravel extraction industries in the Tees Valley. It was noted that they were characterised by having a relatively poor performance against environmental and minerals hierarchy objectives but scored positively when assessed against economic growth and reduction of transport objectives.</p> <p>Option E was deemed to be the least sustainable through assessment given that it will eradicate the sand and gravel industry in the sub region by solely relying on extractions from Durham. This faired poorly against economic, transport and social objective although it scored well against a variety of environmental protection and landscape objectives when examined on a Tees Valley level.</p> <p>Option A was appraised to be significantly detrimental to</p>

	Options					
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E	Comments / Mitigation
						<p>biodiversity and landscapes given the harmful nature of sand / gravel dredging on marine and coastal ecosystems. This is compounded by the fact that some of the sub-regions most important ecological areas are within costal and fluvial locations. Notwithstanding this, Option A did score well against waste hierarchy objectives and economic stability objectives given that has sand and gravel shall be extracted from a replenishable source which is also currently used.</p> <p>It must be noted that Option D scored relatively uncertainly given that it seeks a combination approach which, as yet, cannot be readily defined. Notwithstanding this, it still seeks to increase the extraction of sand and gravel within the Tees Valley. If a suitable combination could be achieved utilising Option A and others then Option D could be considered to being an appropriate and flexible approach particularly in view of the external uncertainty over the status of the reserve at Stockton Quarry</p> <p>In summary, the progression of Options B – D is deemed to be the most sustainable.</p>

**Key**

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 5 – Recycling of alternative materials**

How can the Tees Valley increase its contribution to the recycling of alternative materials for aggregate use?

***Options***

- A. Specific sites should be allocated for the processing of alternative materials so that they are suitable for aggregates use;
- B. The development of processing facilities on existing minerals or waste sites should be promoted;
- C. The development of processing facilities on existing development sites, which are not minerals and waste related, should be promoted;
- D. A combination of the above.


SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	++	++	++	++	All of the options seek to move minerals consumption up the minerals hierarchy.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	++	++	++	++	As above
3. To make better use of all resources	++	++	++	++	As above
4. To ensure good air quality for all	?	?	?	+	It is noted that the impact on air quality is relatively uncertain due to the unknown specifics regarding location and transport movements. For example some 'new sites' (Option A) may be located in a suitably central



SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
					<p>location rather than being juxtaposed to specific contributing industries. Alternatively specific methods may principally benefit from adjacent industries through symbiotic process therefore having them within or next to current sites (Options B and C) will be preferred.</p> <p>It is also noted that the processing of the materials in general has potential to emit a degree of air pollutants.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that Option D allows enough flexibility to allow sites to be located in the most suitable areas from a sub regional perspective and thereby scores marginally better than the other options.</p>
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	?	?	?	+	<p>Again, it is considered that all of the options have potential to impact on this SA objective but without a detailed understanding of location specific elements the scoring must be uncertain until progression towards project level implementation. The assumption has been made that all of the options will seek to develop on PDL as a priority and therefore impact on this objective may be kept to a minimum. It would be a recommendation of this appraisal that PDL is explicitly developed over greenfield locations.</p> <p>It is considered that Option D scores marginally better than the other Options given that it retains a flexible nature so that sites can be located where they may least effect biodiversity.</p>

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	?	?	?	+	Similar to the comments noted above that the implementation of A – D will expressly effect landscapes although the extent is unknown at this strategic stage. It should be recommended that explicit reference is made to the preferential use of brownfield / previously developed land.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region’s cultural heritage	?	?	?	+	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	?	?	?	+	<p>It is noted that the impact on climate change is relatively uncertain due to the unknown specifics regarding location and transport movements. For example some ‘new sites’ (Option A) may be located in a suitably central location rather than being juxtaposed to specific contributing industries. Alternatively specific methods may principally benefit from adjacent industries through symbiotic process therefore having them within or next to current sites (Options B and C) will be preferred.</p> <p>It is also noted that the processing of the materials in general has potential to emit a degree of air pollutants.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that Option D allows enough flexibility to allow sites to be located in the most suitable areas from a sub regional perspective and thereby scores marginally better than the other options.</p>
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	++	++	++	++	All options are deemed to positively contribute towards strengthening the Tees Valley's minerals, waste and recycling industries.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	?	?	?	+	<p>Location specific details and transport movements are all uncertain at this strategic level and are deemed un-appraisable until a project level. For example some 'new sites' (Option A) may be located in a suitably central location rather than being juxtaposed to specific contributing industries. Alternatively specific methods may principally benefit from adjacent industries through symbiotic process therefore having them within or next to current sites (Options B and C) will be preferred.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is considered that Option D allows enough flexibility to allow sites to be located in the most suitable areas from a sub regional perspective and thereby scores marginally better than the other options.</p>

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	<p>?</p> <p>Uncertain</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Uncertain</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Uncertain</p>	<p> OK</p> <p>???</p>	<p>All Options scored significantly well against a number of Sustainability Objectives such as moving up the minerals hierarchy, economic growth and making best use of resources. Notwithstanding this, Options A – C scored a high number of uncertain relationships with some of the more detailed / specific criteria questions, for example in terms of impacts on transport, climate change and landscape.</p> <p>In terms of transport and climate change it was noted that some ‘new sites’ (Option A) may be located in a suitably central location rather than being juxtaposed to specific contributing industries. Alternatively specific methods may principally benefit from adjacent industries through symbiotic process therefore having them within or next to current sites (Options B and C) will be preferred.</p> <p>Uncertain relationships were also identified with landscape, biodiversity and impact on the historic environment as all locations / types of installations will have very different impacts that can only be assessed on at a project level. The assumption has been made that all of the options will seek to develop on PDL as a priority and therefore impact on this landscape, biodiversity and resources may be kept to a minimum. <b><u>It is a recommendation of this appraisal that explicit reference is made to the preferential use of brownfield / previously developed land.</u></b></p> <p>Overall it is considered that Option D scores marginally better than all</p>

	Options				
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	Comments / Mitigation
					other Options given that it retains a flexible nature / approach so that sites can be located in the most appropriate locations bearing in mind the above unknowns and should be assessed at a project level.

**Key**

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 6 – Marine dredged sand and gravel**

How can the Tees Valley continue to support the landing of marine dredged sand & gravel?

***Options***






- A. Sufficient wharf infrastructure is in place to provide appropriate support to the landing of marine dredged sand and gravel, and no further land is required for further infrastructure.
- B. Allocate land adjacent to existing wharves to provide sufficient space for the expansion of the wharves;
- C. Allocate land for the development of a new wharf, or wharves, to complement the existing facilities;
- D. Safeguard land for future infrastructure use; or
- E. A combination approach, taking elements from the above options.

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship It is considered that this sort of extraction is naturally replenishable and therefore does not fit within the minerals hierarchy.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship  It is noted that dredging has the potential to effect water flows, hydraulics and currents. Notwithstanding this, it is clear that the MWDPDs shall not be concerned with actual extractions rather the land required to hold landings. To this extent no relationship has been identified.
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	+	-	-	-	?	Options B – C are all concerned with the creation or safeguarding of new wharves. To this extent it is quite clear that such a development has potential to affect biodiversity. It is noted that the Teesmouth is a European Protected site and there are a number of SSSI's in proximity to the river. To this extent it is essential that new development in these areas are justified and adequately located / managed to protect biodiversity. Mitigation at a project level may be able to resolve negative impacts.  Option E must score uncertain at this present time given that it unclear what combination approach shall be taken.  Option A is deemed to score positively as it does not proposed ant new wharf infrastructure and by default will not cause any further impact on biodiversity than the baseline situation.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and	+	-	-	-	?	Similar to the comments noted above that the implementation of B – D create potential to negatively impact on coastal landscapes.

SA Objective	Options					Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	E	
landscapes						landscapes. It is noted that mitigation on a project level may mitigate a number of detrimental impacts.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	+	-	-	-	?	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	+	++	++	++	?	Options A – D score well given that they will continue to support the dredging of sand and gravel industries and secondary users within the Tees Valley. Options B – D are deemed to score significantly well given that they are likely to stimulate new jobs and business through wharf expansion than Option A.  Again, it is noted that the combination Option (E) remains uncertain until it is quantified,



	Options					
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E	Comments / Mitigation
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship It was noted that Options C – E may open up the potential for new modes of transport for the dredged material by virtue on locating in new accessible locations. Notwithstanding this the relationship was deemed too tenuous and no relationship afforded.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	 OK	 OK	 uncertain	Options B – D all scored relatively well against economic objectives but poorly against biodiversity, landscape and cultural environment ones given that increased wharf development creates potential to negatively impact on sensitive areas on Teesmouth. The Teesmouth and river banks support a number of SSSIs and the sub regions only European Protected sites. Given the sensitivity of the area a precautionary approach is likely to be favoured towards development in close proximity to designated sites. Notwithstanding this, it is clear that mitigation and appropriate siting of new infrastructure can reduce or eliminate negative impacts. Option E was deemed to score uncertain given that it recommends a combination approach that at present cannot be quantified.

	Options					
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E	Comments / Mitigation
						Option A was appraised to be the most sustainable option given that it seeks to retain the current baseline of dredging, thereby scoring well against economic objectives, but also not expanding operations that create potential to negatively impact on what can be a relatively sensitive area in ecological and landscape terms.

**Key**

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 7 – Coal supply**

Are there sufficient remaining coal resources in the Tees Valley to enable the Tees Valley to make provision for the supply of coal in the plan period?



***Options***

- A. No. The coal resources which are located within the Tees Valley are unlikely to be viable to allow a provision to be made from the Tees Valley.
- B. Yes. The coal resources in the Tees Valley could provide a viable supply in the future and account should be made for this possibility.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	-	+	The assumption has been made that if Option A is progressed it will lead to a preferred option that will seek the allocation or extraction of more coal or coal sites. To this extent it will fair badly against the minerals hierarchy as more primary resources will be extracted within the sub region. Option B will continue to extract no or limited coal from Southfileds thereby negligibly contributing towards the minerals hierarchy by limiting supply. It is noted that coal will be sourced from outside the Tees Valley in reality.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	++	-	Option A scores significantly positively as the assumption is made that if implemented new resources would be identified and extracted – thereby making use of these geological resources prior to sterilisation. Option B scores

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
			poorly given that although sources of coal are clearly identified in the Tees Valley that none are currently being worked / extracted.
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	No relationship
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	-	0	Assumption made that the implementation of option A shall lead to further extractions sites thus potentially impacting on biodiversity. Option B is deemed to be the baseline or 'business as usual' approach that has already identified and addressed the majority of biodiversity issues.  Notwithstanding this, it is noted that project level mitigation may resolve the majority of concerns.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	-	0	As above
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	0	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	-	+	Discussions noted that the consumption of coal in general goes against the ethos of this objective and therefore implementing the Option A which is likely

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
impacts of climate change			to increase coal extraction and in turn coal combustion will score negatively. It does not score significantly negatively because it is acknowledged that new sites may reduce the need to transport coal into the Tees Valley from other regions. Option A scores marginally positively given that it implements the baseline scenario where no coal is currently extracted. It is however noted that this shall lead to increased reliance on transboundary movement of coal.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	++	-	Option A is deemed to score marginally more positive in the long term given that it will lead to the creation of new extraction points in the long term and associated new jobs.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	++	--	It is noted that if new extraction sites are likely to result from the implementation of Option A therefore local supply is likely to be increased in the long term and cut down on requirement to travel. It is noted that along with the new extraction points a sufficient transport infrastructure potential utilising

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
			rail and port facilities should be closely examined.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	<p>This issue is very dependant on a full and proper consideration of all available evidence such as British Geological Survey reports and other information to assess the quality of coal in the Tees Valley. Notwithstanding this, this appraisal has shown that option A is considered to be the most sustainable option because in the long term it is likely to create new jobs, contribute towards making the Tees Valley self sufficient in coal and reduce the reliance / transport of transboundary mineral movements. <u>It is a recommendation of this appraisal that if Option A is pursued that explicitly cognisance is given to the increased use of port and rail facilities for both internal and transboundary materials movement from new extraction sites.</u></p> <p>The Option did however score relatively poorly against environmental objectives as it creates the potential for impact on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage. Mitigation at a project level may reduce some of these concerns.</p>

**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 8 – Potash**

How should the existing Potash mine at Boulby be dealt with in the Minerals and Waste DPDs?



***Options***

- A. The Minerals and Waste DPDs should concentrate on the transport infrastructure required to transport the materials through the Tees Valley, and from Tees Dock.
- B. The Minerals and Waste DPDs should consider the possibility that extractive workings may be required within the Tees Valley, alongside the consideration given to the transport infrastructure.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	-	Option B seeks to increase / expand the extraction of a primary mineral whilst option does not specifically relate to extraction levels.  It is noted that the site is the only Potash mine in the Country and is therefore a very important and limited resource.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	+	++	Option B scores significantly positively as the assumption is made that the resources that are within the Tees Valley will, in the future, be extracted. Option A does not relate to extraction levels but is deemed positive as it seeks to maximise the use of sustainable transport to transit potash and salt.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	No relationship
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	-	--	Both options create potential to negatively impact on biodiversity through the creation of new extraction points (Option B) and new transport facilities (Options A and B) especially around Tees Dock. Notwithstanding this, project level mitigation can resolve a number of concerns.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	-	--	As above
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	--	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	++	++	Both options seek to maximise use of rail and port facilities to transport this widely exported commodity. If Option B is progressed it is recommended that rail infrastructure at source is developed.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	No relationship



SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	+	++	Both options are deemed to score positively with this objective given that they will create new jobs and stimulate economic growth through the creation of sustainable transport infrastructure and increased export of potash (Option B).
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	++	++	Both options seek to maximise use of rail and port facilities to transport this widely exported commodity. If Option B is progressed it is recommended that rail infrastructure at source is developed.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 OK	 OK	The appraisal did not conclude with a clear preferred option. Both scored equally well and could be progressed for different reasons although if a precautionary approach is adopted then Option A would be favoured as it does not seek to extent the extraction of Potash which has potential to negatively impact on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage within Redcar and

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
			<p>Cleveland. That said, project level mitigation may be able to reduce impacts.</p> <p>Option B was however deemed to be a better use of natural resources and likely to increase economic production in the long term.</p>

**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 10 – Safeguarding mineral deposits**



What approach should be taken to the safeguarding of mineral deposits from sterilisation?

***Options***

- A. Given the scarcity of viable minerals deposits in the Tees Valley, minerals safeguarding areas should be identified and a high level of protection given to the resources in these areas to prevent their sterilisation; or
- B. There is no need to safeguard the remaining mineral deposits in the Tees Valley, given that the deposits which are remaining are of inferior quality

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	-	+	The assumption has been made throughout this appraisal that Option A will lead to the extraction of the safeguarded minerals in the future.  If Option B is progressed there will be less primary mineral extraction in the Tees Valley thereby contributing to this objective on a sub regional basis.
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	++	-	Option A is clearly making the best use of natural resources.
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	Both options create potential to negatively impact on biodiversity through the creation of new extraction points (Option A) and new general development in the short term if not safeguarded (Option B). Relationship with this objective is a project specific consideration.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	-	-	As above
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	-	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	+	-	Noted that future extraction of minerals in Tees Valley may reduce reliance on transboundary imports.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in	X	X	No relationship

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
health			
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	+	+	Both options are deemed to score positively with this objective given that both the creation of new extraction points (Option A) and new general development in the short term if not safeguarded (Option B) are likely to create jobs and support economic growth.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	+	-	Noted that future extraction of minerals in Tees Valley may reduce reliance on transboundary imports.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	The appraisal showed that both options scored very similarly. The assumption was made that strict safeguarding (Option A) would lead to future extractions. To this extent Option A scored significantly well against making best use of natural resources (Objective 3). Both options scored negatively against biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage objectives given that they are both likely to lead to new development - Option B in short term as new uses are found for historically safeguarded sites and Option A in the long term for extraction purposes. These relationships were deemed to be project specific

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
			that could be addressed through mitigation.

**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 13 – Provision of waste management facilities**

In the allocation of sites for waste management facilities in the Tees Valley, what approach should be taken?

***Options***

- A. Clusters of related waste resource facilities on sites located in the traditional industrial areas around the River Tees;
- B. Clusters of related waste resource facilities with no particular focus on their location;
- C. Individual sites spread throughout the Tees Valley.
- D. A combination approach, which provides both individual sites throughout the area, and also clusters of facilities to provide a wider ranging focus for waste management.





SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	++	+	+	++	All of the options explicitly seek to move waste up the hierarchy through the implementation of an adequate management infrastructure. It is considered that A and D are more favourable as they are likely to lead to more symbiotic recycling / reuse practices through careful location.
3. To make better use of all resources	++	+	+	++	As above
4. To ensure good air quality for all	+	+	+	++	This issue is closely linked to transport movements and type of management facility proposed (if that process releases emissions). For the

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
for all					<p>management facility proposed (if that process releases emissions). For the purpose of this strategic appraisal the assumption has been made that the proposed management facilities shall not significantly reduce air quality through their operation. The assumption has also been made that transboundary materials movement, in particular waste imports into the Tees Valley remain at the baseline level and are not dependant on clustering approach.</p> <p>Option A and B both score positively given that they both seek to cluster industries / facilities thereby reducing transportation requirements and increasing symbiotic working.</p> <p>Although Option C does not seek to cluster process or industries, thereby increasing need to travel / transport materials, it does however reduce the need to travel at initial stage to deposit waste. Community transport is considered to be reduced by the implementation of Option C.</p> <p>Option D is deemed to score significantly positive as it will contribute towards reducing both primary and secondary materials movements from source, collection and management points whilst ultimately making use of clusters / symbiosis.</p>
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	+	-	-	- / +	The assumption has been made that traditional industrial areas in the Tees Valley do not foster a high degree of biodiversity. Notwithstanding this, it is clear that appropriate surveys are carried out on project basis. To this



SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
geodiversity					<p>extent, option A is deemed to be most suitable as it is the only Option to specifically utilise existing sites. Option D also has potential to use traditional sites although it is not explicitly referenced.</p> <p>Options B and C are considered to be marginally negative given that they suggest new development may be located at new sites where biodiversity may be present. It is noted mitigation may contribute towards mitigating against negative impacts and it is likely that full EIA compliance shall be necessary.</p>
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	+	-	-	- / +	Similar to the comments noted above that the implementation of A – D will expressly effect landscapes although the extent is to an extent unknown at this strategic stage. It should be recommended that explicit reference is made to the preferential use of brownfield / previously developed land preferentially to greenfield locations. Again the assumption has been made that traditional industrial areas have low landscape value.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	+	-	-	- / +	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	+	+	+	++	This issue is closely linked to transport movements and type of management facility proposed (if that process releases emissions). For the purpose of this strategic appraisal the assumption has been made that the proposed management facilities shall not significantly reduce air quality through their operation. The assumption has also been made that transboundary materials movement, in particular waste imports into the

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
					<p>Tees Valley remain at the baseline level and are not dependant on clustering approach.</p> <p>Option A and B both score positively given that they both seek to cluster industries / facilities thereby reducing transportation requirements and increasing symbiotic working.</p> <p>Although Option C does not seek to cluster process or industries, thereby increasing need to travel / transport materials, it does however reduce the need to travel at initial stage to deposit waste. Community transport is considered to be reduced by the implementation of Option C.</p> <p>Option D is deemed to score significantly positive as it will contribute towards reducing both primary and secondary materials movements from source, collection and management points whilst ultimately making use of clusters / symbiosis.</p>
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	++	++	++	++	All options are deemed to positively contribute towards strengthening the Tees Valley's waste and recycling industries.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	+	+	-	++	Comments as noted under objective 9. It should be explicitly noted under this issue that whatever option is progressed that maximum use of rail and port facilities should be utilised.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	+	+	++	+	All Options score positively given they will increase provisions within the Tees Valley. Notwithstanding this, Option C shall significantly address the indicator questions by reducing the need for communities to travel and dealing with waste as close to source as feasible.
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	 OK	 Good	<p>All Options scored significantly well against a number of Sustainability Objectives such as moving up the waste hierarchy and economic growth. Notwithstanding this, Option A was identified as being the most sustainable option. Option D could also be considered if the 'combination' approach included clusters within traditional industrial areas.</p> <p>It must be noted that a number of assumptions were made during the appraisal of these strategic options. They included that the proposed management facilities shall not significantly reduce air quality through</p>

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
				<p style="text-align: center;">?</p> <p>uncertain</p>	<p>their operation themselves and that transboundary materials movement, in particular waste imports into the Tees Valley remain at the baseline level and are not dependant on clustering approaches.</p> <p>Options B and C scored potentially negatively with landscape, biodiversity and impact on the historic environment objectives as all locations / types of installations have potential to have negative impacts that can only be assessed on at a project level. The assumption has been made that all of the options will seek to develop on PDL as a priority and therefore impact on this landscape, biodiversity and resources may be kept to a minimum. <u>It is a recommendation of this appraisal that explicit reference is made to the preferential use of brownfield / previously developed land.</u></p> <p>Furthermore, appraisal against objective 14 also noted that any option that is progressed should clearly state <u>that rail and port infrastructure should be fully utilised.</u></p>

**Key**

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 14 – Allocation of sites**



What approach should be taken to the allocation of sites, should it be determined that allocations are required?

***Options***

- A. A flexible approach, that leaves the development policies on the site open ended to allow for changing circumstances in the future;
- B. A focussed approach which gives more certainty as to what developments would be permitted on the site and the use of review and amendment procedures to take into account changing circumstances in the future.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship Uncertain what facilities are proposed if any at all.
3. To make better use of all resources	X	X	No relationship
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	No relationship
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	Both Options are deemed to score positively.  Option A can evolve an approach to develop with time depending on future trends of biodiversity and technology. The assumption has been made that impact on biodiversity shall be a key consideration when allocating sites for management facilities. Option B also scores positively as it provides certainty for the interaction between the specific type of proposed installation and its site specific locale.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	+	+	As above
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	+	+	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	+	+	As above. Key consideration is location of infrastructure.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in	-	++	Option B explicitly provides certainty to the community over the location of particular types of installations.

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
health			
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	X	X	No relationship
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	+	+	As noted comments for Objective 6. Key consideration is location of infrastructure.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 OK	 Good	<p>The appraisal showed that Option B is marginally more sustainable than Option A given that it provides a greater certainty for communities on what facilities shall be located in specific locations, potentially affecting their lives. It ensures the public have opportunity to input to the wide array of consultation opportunities that exists when allocating sites through a strong plan led and prescriptive system. Notwithstanding this, Option A also scored relatively positively given that a flexible approach can adapt with changing locale, biodiversity and technology to ensure the most appropriate facility is</p>

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
			progressed at any specific locations.

**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------



**Issue 15 – Land for waste developments**

How should land for waste developments be identified within the Policies and Sites DPD?





***Options***

- A. Site specific allocations where development would normally be permitted, subject to the proposals being in accordance with all other relevant policies;
- B. Areas of Search within which plots of land for development are likely to be acceptable, subject to being in accordance with all other relevant policies;
- C. A combination of A and B, where site specific allocations are made where possible, but areas of search are also used as a guide to where other developments would be appropriate;
- D. No allocations are made and all proposals are assessed against the relevant policies in the Local Development Framework as to whether they are appropriate.

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	X	X	No relationship Uncertainty over what facilities are being proposed.
3. To make better use of all resources	X	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
4. To ensure good air quality for all	++	+	+	-	<p>The assumption has been made that assessing infrastructure and type of facility and air quality specific to the locale will be key considerations when allocating land / sites for facilities.</p> <p>To this extent it is clear that Option A is the favoured approach with both Options B and C scoring relatively well as they both generally adhere to a specific planned approach based on location specific criteria.</p>
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	++	+	+	-	As noted above it is considered that the allocation of sites shall be based on detailed research of the type of facility proposed and the characteristics of the site. Therefore Option A provides greatest certainty.
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	++	+	+	-	As above
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	++	+	+	-	As above
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	++	+	+	-	As above

SA Objective	Options				Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	D	
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	++	+	+	-	The assumption has been made that assessing infrastructure and flood risk specific to the locale will be key considerations when allocating land / sites for facilities.  To this extent it is clear that Option A is the favoured approach with both Options B and C scoring relatively well as they both generally adhere to a specific planned approach based on location specific criteria.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	++	+	+	-	Certainty for communities greatly enhanced though implementation of Option A.
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	+	++	++	++	Option C and D considered to be most efficient for development of industry by reducing site specific problems / issues. Notwithstanding this, Options A and B also provide relative certainty and principle of development has already been established,.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	++	+	+	-	The assumption has been made that assessing infrastructure will be key considerations when allocating land / sites for facilities.

	Options				
SA Objective	A	B	C	D	Comments / Mitigation
of transport mode					
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	++	+	+	-	As above. Proximity and ease / appropriateness of access deemed to be key consideration.
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	 OK	 Bad	Options A – C all scored well with Option A being appraised to be the most sustainable. Option A is deemed to give the highest degree of certainty for the community, Authorities and industry by carefully locating sites based on detailed criteria and locale specific considerations. Option D has been discounted as it has appraised negatively against the majority of the SA objectives.

**Key**

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 16 – Land for waste developments**

Should the allocation of sites focus on existing sites in the Tees valley, or look to provide new sites?




***Options***

- A. Existing sites, including extensions.
- B. New sites.
- C. A combination of the above two options should be used.

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	+	+	+	All options have the potential to locate in areas that make use of symbiotic processes. Relatively uncertain at present although positive overall.
3. To make better use of all resources	+	+	+	As above it is considered that pursuit of all options could positively contribute to this objective.
4. To ensure good air quality for all	+	?	?	It is considered that in the short term it is likely that the use / expansion of existing sites (Option A) will lead to least traffic movements as infrastructure and supportive industries are already present. Notwithstanding this, in the long term new sites may become clusters in themselves and potentially ever more sustainable than existing sites if infrastructure is adequately planned and implemented. To this extent an

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
				uncertain scoring has been afforded to Options B and C. It is considered that any preferred Option should specifically seek to make maximum use of road and port facilities.
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	+	-	-	The assumption has been made that existing sites (Option A) have relatively low biodiversity credentials at present and therefore scores more positively than options B and C. It is however clear that a full ecology assessment will need to be carried out at a project level.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	?	?	?	The assumption has been made that existing sites (Option A) shall be more receptive, in landscaping terms, to new waste development than new sites in the short term. However, this may not be the case on a cumulative level and must be assessed on a project specific basis. That said Option B and C also score largely uncertainly given the location specific nature of this issue and objective question. Full assessments must be carried out at a project level stage.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	?	?	?	As above.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	+	?	?	It is considered that in the short term it is likely that the use / expansion of existing sites (Option A) will lead to least traffic movements as

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
impacts of climate change				existing sites (Option A) will lead to least traffic movements as infrastructure and supportive industries are already present. Notwithstanding this, in the long term new sites may become clusters in themselves and potentially ever more sustainable than existing sites if infrastructure is adequately planned and implemented. To this extent an uncertain scoring has been afforded to Options B and C. It is considered that any preferred Option should specifically seek to make maximum use of road / port facilities and new facilities in particular demonstrates high sustainable credentials in terms of design, construction and maintenance.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	X	No relationship
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	++	++	++	All options are deemed to positively contribute towards strengthening the Tees Valley's waste and recycling industries. It is noted that Option A is likely to be more fruitful in the short term whereas Options B or C could ultimately provide greater economic stimulation in the long term.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	++	++	++	As above

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	+	?	?	It is considered that in the short term it is likely that the use / expansion of existing sites (Option A) will lead to least traffic movements as infrastructure and supportive industries are already present. Notwithstanding this, in the long term new sites may become clusters in themselves and potentially ever more sustainable than existing sites if infrastructure is adequately planned and implemented. To this extent an uncertain scoring has been afforded to Options B and C. It is considered that any preferred Option should specifically seek to make maximum use of road / port facilities and new facilities in particular demonstrates high sustainable credentials in terms of design, construction and maintenance.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 Good	 OK	 OK	<p>All Options scored significantly well against a number of Sustainability Objectives such as moving up the waste hierarchy, economic growth and making best use of resources. Notwithstanding this, Options B and C scored a high number of uncertain relationships with some of the more detailed / specific criteria questions, for example in terms of impacts on transport, climate change and landscape which shall be addressed at allocation or project level.</p> <p>It was evident that in the short term Option A is the most sustainable as it will make use of existing infrastructure, supporting industries and a number of environmental considerations are already likely to have been</p>



	Options			
SA Objective	A	B	C	Comments / Mitigation
				<p>addressed. That said, on a cumulative level and if new facilities are developed in an sustainable manner then they too have the potential to become the favoured options.</p> <p><u>It is considered that any preferred Option should specifically seek to make maximum use of road / port facilities and new facilities in particular demonstrates high sustainable credentials in terms of design, construction and maintenance. The assumption has been made that all of the options will seek to develop on PDL as a priority and therefore impact on this landscape, biodiversity and resources may be kept to a minimum.</u></p>

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 17 – Development control policies**




What scope should the protective Development Control policies of the Minerals and Waste DPDs take?

***Options***

- A. An extremely limited range of policies. The various subjects would be protected from any adverse impacts as the result of development existing policy and by other legislation and organisations, which are already in place. Policies should only be included where there is no other relevant protection afforded elsewhere.
- B. A range of development control policies which do not exclude any areas of land from development, but ensures every proposal is assessed on its individual merits against the sensitivities of its proposed location.
- C. A comprehensive range of development control policies which are specifically written with minerals and waste developments in mind, and which provide a high degree of protection to local communities and rule out development in sensitive areas to ensure they are not adversely affected.

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
4. To ensure good air quality for all	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	-	0	+	Only a comprehensive set of policies shall provide optimum environmental protection at a Tees Valley level.
10. To reduce crime	X	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options			Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	C	
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	-	0	+	A comprehensive set of policies shall afford greatest certainty to the public.
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	X	X	X	No relationship
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	X	X	X	No relationship
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	X	X	X	No relationship
<b>Summary</b>	 Bad			This issue is more of a procedural matter than a spatial option. Notwithstanding this, the appraisal has shown that Option C provides the highest degree of environmental and social protection in the climate of the Tees Valley. Option A has been discounted.

	Options			
SA Objective	A	B	C	Comments / Mitigation
		OK	Good	

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 19 – Sustainable transport**



What approach should be taken to the planning for sustainable transport?

***Options***

- A. Sustainable transport will be adequately covered elsewhere in the Local Development Frameworks and as the principles are the same for minerals and waste developments, as they are for all developments, there is no need to repeat them in the Minerals and Waste DPDs.
- B. Sustainable transport relating to minerals and waste developments is distinct from other forms of development, and should therefore be specifically covered in the Minerals and Waste DPDs.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	X	X	No relationship
4. To ensure good air quality for all	0	+	It is acknowledged that this is a relatively procedural matter and not necessarily spatial. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that MWDPD specific policies on transport (Option B) is likely to provide the most suitable outcome and serve the minerals and waste industry in the Tees Valley most appropriately.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	X	X	No relationship
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	X	X	No relationship
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	X	X	No relationship
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	X	X	No relationship
10. To reduce crime	X	X	No relationship
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	X	X	No relationship

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	X	X	No relationship
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	X	X	No relationship
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	0	+	It is acknowledged that this is a relatively procedural matter and not necessarily spatial. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that MWDPD specific policies on transport (Option B) is likely to provide the most suitable outcome and serve the minerals and waste industry in the Tees Valley most appropriately.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	0	+	It is acknowledged that this is a relatively procedural matter and not necessarily spatial. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that MWDPD specific policies on transport (Option B) is likely to provide the most suitable outcome and serve the minerals and waste industry in the Tees Valley most appropriately.
<b>Summary</b>	 OK	 Good	It is acknowledged that this is a relatively procedural matter and not necessarily spatial. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that MWDPD specific policies on transport (Option B) is likely to provide the most suitable outcome and serve the minerals and waste industry in the Tees Valley most appropriately.



**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------

**Issue 20 – Reclamation**

What approach should be taken in respect of the reclamation of sites?

Options:

- A. An approach which provides a specific focus for all reclamation schemes.
- B. A less focussed approach which allows for reclamation proposals designed specifically for that site.

Should option A be considered, what focus should reclamation schemes have?

Options include:

Bio-mass fuel production;

Bio-diversity;

Woodlands;



Tourism;

Informal Recreation.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
1. To move up the minerals hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
2. To move up the waste hierarchy	X	X	No relationship
3. To make better use of all resources	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
resources			sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
4. To ensure good air quality for all	X	X	No relationship
5. To protect and enhance the quality of the sub region's controlled waters?	X	X	No relationship
6. To protect and enhance the sub-region's biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	Although the creation of woodland or wildlife habitats, if pursued under option A, were implemented there is likely to be a positive relationship. Notwithstanding this it is deemed that Option B is most suitable as it allows for flexibility bases on site specific characteristics.
7. To protect and enhance the quality and diversity of the rural and urban land and landscapes	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
8. To protect and enhance the sub region's cultural heritage	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
9. To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change	X	X	No relationship

SA Objective	Options		Comments / Mitigation
	A	B	
10. To reduce crime	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
11. To improve and safeguard health and well-being while reducing inequalities in health	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
12. To ensure high and stable levels of employment and economic growth in the Tees Valley	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
13. To raise educational and training achievement across the sub region	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
14. To reduce the movement of materials and increase choice of transport mode	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.
15. Access to waste and minerals facilities	-	+	Option B is considered to allow flexibility that will make best use of certain sites for the most appropriate restoration activities.

	Options		
SA Objective	A	B	Comments / Mitigation
<b>Summary</b>	 Bad	 Good	The appraisal has shown that Option B is the most sustainable Option given that it allows flexibility to establish the most appropriate restoration activity for the specific site / locale. It was noted that a specific activities such as woodland planting or habitat creation would have significantly positive relationships with certain objectives but the success of such a venture is wholly reliant on locational / site characteristics which implies B is the most suitable option. Option A has been discounted.

**Key**

Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	X	No Relationship	?	Uncertain	0	Neutral
-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	-----------------	---	-----------	---	---------