

# East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan

## Revised Policies - Main Modifications

### Authorities' Comments on Responses Received (MM-R02)

26 January 2024

A Public Consultation on the proposed Main Modifications to the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan - Revised Policies was held between Friday 22 October 2023 and Friday 22 December 2023. A total of 20 responses were received. The Inspectors have requested the Authorities to submit a response to the responses received.

Respondent	Authorities Comments
<b>Brett Group</b>	<p>Brett Group reiterates their position as set out during the Examination to date; it is understood that their position is that Lydd should be allocated, and in their view, Broomhill North be safeguarded.</p> <p>The Authorities refer the Inspectors to their previous submissions made during and after the Hearings in respect of Lydd and have no additional comments at this time.</p>
<b>Central Bedfordshire Council</b>	<p>Central Bedfordshire Council suggest the words: 'where consideration against other policies in the Development Plan indicate there would be no unacceptable adverse impact' should be deleted from Policy RM1, on the grounds it is not necessary.</p> <p>The Authorities are of the view that this proposed modification arose because of the Hearings and is therefore necessary.</p>
<b>Day Group</b>	<p>The Day Group response focuses on the content of the Aggregates Technical Data Paper Addendum and set out their position that they believe that the 2019 British Geological Aggregates Survey is the best and available data and there is a shortage of materials in the Plan Area and the balance of imports and exports.</p> <p>The Authorities have presented all the information available to them in the documents presented to the Examination and are of the view the Plan makes adequate provision for the steady and adequate supply of minerals based on sites promoted and facts in front of them.</p>
<b>Eastbourne Borough Council</b>	<p>Eastbourne Borough Council noted several elements of the Revised Policies relating to the location of waste management, and the updated Minerals and Waste Development Scheme.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response.</p>

MM-R02

<b>Environment Agency</b>	<p>The Environment Agency are pleased to see that requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain have been included within the proposed modifications and no further comments to make.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response.</p>
<b>Kent County Council</b>	<p>Kent County Council’s response summarises their understanding of the situation with regards to minerals providing and safeguarding. They in particular support the safeguarding provisions.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response.</p>
<b>Lewes District Council</b>	<p>Lewes District Council notes that policy WMP3d is being retained but are disappointed by the lack of increased emphasis on a ‘circular’ economy approach to the reuse and recycling of construction waste. The Council also notes the new safeguarding extents in relation to Newhaven and Policy RM5 (safeguarding), noting the presence of the Enterprise Zone, and hopes the County Council will continue to work with them particularly with regard to development sites within the Enterprise Zone. They consider that the emerging Lewes District Local Plan is compatible with the revised Policy RM5. Lewes District Council also welcome the modifications proposed to Policy RD1 alongside the positive wording in the supporting text to ensure that biodiversity gains are commensurate with requirements under the Environment Act.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response and look forward to continuing to work with the District Council.</p>
<b>Marine Management Organisation</b>	<p>The Marine Management Organisation supports the references to the South Marine Plan Policies S-AGG-3 and S-AGG-4 referenced within the plan and suggests that these policies could be further expanded on. South Marine Plan’s Policy S-INF-1 is also highly relevant to RM5. The organisation suggests that a minor adjustment could also be made to section 3.9 which describes the Marine Management Organisation’s responsibilities and the South Marine Plan’s remit. The representation makes reference to the Marine Management Organisations remit as described in the agreed Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response; the proposed alterations have been noted, and we will consider them as part of the future review of the Plan, but given their minor nature, and the late stage of the examination, it is not proposed to incorporate them at this time.</p>
<b>Minerals Products Association</b>	<p>The Minerals Products Association is of the view that: by reducing the plan period to 2030, that it will be out date by the time it is adopted as it will have a relatively short end date; in relation to Footnotes 2 and 4 that the term small-scale waste management facilities should relate to the physical or throughput scale rather than localised need; Footnote 8 should be deleted to remove reference to the area being a ”special case”; the estimated demand for aggregates remains underestimated; supports the MCAs at Rye</p>

	<p>and Newhaven. Various comments on the detail of the Aggregates Technical Data Paper Addendum.</p> <p>The Authorities refer the Inspectors to their previous submissions made during and after the Hearings in respect of plan lifespan, footnotes 2 and 4 (definition of small-scale waste management facilities), footnote 8 (“special case”).</p> <p>The Authorities and the MPA are of a differing view as to the level of demand that will exist during the plan period. In relation to demand, the Authorities have presented all the information available to them in the documents presented to the Examination and are of the view the Plan makes adequate provision for the steady and adequate supply of minerals based on sites promoted and facts in front of them.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the Mineral Product Associations support for the extent of the Rye and the Newhaven MCA.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b></p>	<p>Natural England makes several comments in relation to MM02, MM06, MM08 and MM12 all either supporting or strongly supporting elements of the proposed modifications. Of note, Natural England strongly supports the removal of the listed sites from the list of mineral safeguarded areas given the significant direct and indirect impacts to both nationally and internationally designated sites. Natural England reiterates that reference should be made to RD1 within the Policy wording of RV1.</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the response. The suggested cross referencing is not considered necessary.</p>
<p><b>Rother District Council</b></p>	<p>Rother District Council reiterate their previously raise concerns regarding the extent of the Rye Consultation Areas, the vagueness of word “affecting”, and that minerals infrastructure assessments will be too onerous for applicants.</p> <p>The Authorities refer the Inspectors to their previous submissions made during and after the Hearings in respect of Rye and have no additional comments at this time.</p>

The following nine respondents submitted a response indicating that they had no comments: Ashford Borough Council; Capita; Gloucestershire; Herefordshire; Historic England; National Highways; Southern Water; Surrey County Council; Wolverhampton Council.

