

Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Main Issues Statement

Main Matter 2 – Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy

Questions 23 to 25

Issue: Whether the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy are appropriate, positively prepared and are soundly based and provide an appropriate basis for meeting the future demand for minerals and managing waste sustainably.

Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy

Question 23: Should objective 6 in section 4.2 state “to plan for the steady, adequate and sustainable supply ...”?

Response

- 23.1 The word ‘sustainable’ has been used to incorporate ‘adequate’ and to place it in the wider context of economic, social and environmental priorities, as set out within the objective.
- 23.2 The word ‘adequate’ is used in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF), and would be used as one element of any decision making. Consequently, Herefordshire Council considered it was not necessary to include the word within the Objectives of the Plan.
- 23.3 Herefordshire Council does not object if the Inspectors consider it is necessary to include the word ‘adequate’.

Question 24: Given that Policy SP3 concerns transport within sites, how would the Plan’s policies meet objective 8 in terms of reducing the need to travel, promoting alternatives to road transport and ensuring development is served by suitable transport networks?

Response

- 24.1 These matters are driven by policy within the *Core Strategy* (Examination Library ref. D2.9) the lead document of the development plan. The Plan does not repeat policy already present within the *Core Strategy*.
- 24.2 Policy SP3 has been prepared to address the impacts from transport resulting from minerals and waste development.

Question 25: How would the Plan’s policies meet objective 12 in terms of promoting, utilising and enjoying heritage and cultural assets?

Response

- 25.1 Again, these matters are driven by policy within the *Core Strategy*, the lead document of the development plan. The Plan does not repeat policy already present within the *Core Strategy*.
- 25.2 However, the Plan does address these matters as relevant to minerals and waste development, primarily through policies SP2 (promoting opportunities for access to outdoor spaces and protecting PROW), SP4 (promoting early reclamation of sites incorporating proposals that take account of the site setting) and the key development criteria (requiring assessment of impact on heritage to demonstrate less than substantial harm). The supplementary text provides examples of how these outcomes can be achieved within a project.

- 25.3 In addition, site allocations have been informed by this objective. For example, as reported in the *Supplementary Report to the Spatial Context and Sites Report* (January 2021) (Examination Library refs. [D3.58](#) & [D3.59](#)) site MO5g Land East of Wellington Quarry was amended to avoid unacceptable impact on a heritage asset and site M23 Land at Arrow Green was not allocated on account of the potential for impact on a heritage asset.
- 25.4 Section 2.9 of the *Preparing the Publication Draft Plan* report (Examination Library ref. [D3.46](#)) provides further explanation of the approach used within the Plan, with direct reference to the advice set out at *NPPF* paragraph 185.