

North York Moors National Park Authority

29 June 2026

Item 14, Joint Minerals and Waste Plan – Options for review

1. Purpose of the report

- 1.1 To seek Members' views on options to review the Authority's current Minerals and Waste Joint Plan (MWJP) which is due for review in 2027.

2. Background

- 2.1 Provisions in the 1990 Environment Act confer upon National Park Authorities (NPA) the planning responsibility of County and Unitary Councils in relation to the preparation of Minerals and Waste planning policies. Such policies can be incorporated into Park-wide Local Plans or else can be the subject of separate Minerals and Waste Plans. Regulations also enable local planning authorities to combine plans. A Joint Plan was produced by this NPA together with North Yorkshire County Council and City of York Council (CYC). The Joint Plan covering these three minerals and waste authority areas was adopted by the Authority on 21 March 2022. There is a requirement to review local plans every five years, and a review of the Joint Plan is imminent.
- 2.2 As with the Local Plan Review, the Minerals and Waste Plan is subject to the implications of the Government's new plan-making system which introduces a mandatory 30-month timetable for preparing or reviewing Development Plans. The MWJP is not yet at a point where it is required that the plan is reviewed under the regulations, but it soon will be and the plan period only extends to 2030. It is important that there is a clear path to undertake that review and importantly, given the new plan-making system, the Plan will now need to be produced alongside the Local Plan (or as part of it). The four-month notice period now required for the Notice of Commencement of a Plan means this is triggered at least before 21 November, though the regulations allow in the current transitional period for this deadline to be extended up to 31 December (in practice then little difference). Either way the Gateway 1 Self-Assessment and start month would need to be before 30 April 2027.

3. Current Partner Thinking – Another Joint Plan

- 3.1 Discussions have been ongoing with officers from NYC and CYC councils both of whom have expressed support for maintaining the partnership approach. A working paper was presented to NYC Management Board in May which proposed a timetable for the review, set out an anticipated budget for the project and covered the need to enter into a new partnership agreement with CYC and NYMNP to work collectively on the Plan.
- 3.2 Some early scoping work on the Plan was undertaken in 2025 which involved informal discussions with officers to get an early sense of whether there was still a desire to work on the review of the Plan collectively. Experience of the initial MWJP

was that there are a number of clear advantages: effective use of resources, and a strategic approach across the sub region (given the geography reflects wider minerals and waste considerations and alignment of evidence base work). This enables policies to effectively protect the interests of the National Park from potentially harmful development in its setting which otherwise would have to be achieved through seeking to influence an adjoining authority's plan which is not a guarantee. There are also clear benefits from shared working including access to specialist minerals expertise and legal input with shared costs on generic matters.

- 3.3 A new MWJP would require a new partnership agreement to be drawn up. A starting point would be to use the existing partnership MoU and work undertaken for the recently produced collaborative agreement (established for joint evidence base for local plans and the Spatial Development Strategy), which has involved the York and North Yorkshire CA, City of York Council, NYC and the two National Parks. In addition to arrangements around joint evidence base, the MWJP partnership agreement will need to include clear arrangements for statutory plan making responsibilities and resourcing. This is a key matter for consideration as the proposed likely costs and apportionment between the three authorities has been set by NYC, reflecting the existing position for the MWJP.

4. Likely Costs

- 4.1 NYC have estimated that the evidence base work involved in a review is likely to be upwards of £500,000. Alongside the examination costs with the Planning Inspectorate, and legal fees, it has suggested that a budget of £1 Million would be a reasonable amount (reflecting that there could be significant legal advice required). It is expected that NYC will have the biggest share of the cost reflecting the more limited minerals and waste activity outside of the North Yorkshire Council plan area. In terms of how costs would be apportioned between the three Local Planning Authorities, this is likely to be based on the proportions used last time which was 55% NYC, 25% CYC and 20% NYM. This ratio has already been agreed by NYC's Management Board and is to be presented to Cabinet on 23 June.
- 4.2 Based on this, with a potential budget set at £1.5m, the cost to the NPA would be £300k. For comparison this represents nearly three times the budget for the Authority's Local Plan Review. Although the proportions reflect those originally agreed in 2012, this significantly exceeds available budgets for this work. The 20% share is based on a balance between considerations of population versus geographical size. At the time, an important consideration was also that the joint approach enabled the NPA to tap into the minerals and waste expertise present within North Yorkshire County Council.
- 4.3 Officers have discussed this with NYC pointing out that the Authority's available budget is realistically less than half this amount and asking for a reconsideration of proportions. Officers consider that this proportion does not now reflect the majority of work that would be involved now that policies have already been established in relation to the minerals within the National Park – potash, conventional and shale gas and small-scale building stone. These policies have provided an effective policy framework and can realistically be carried forward in a new plan subject to any changes resulting from national policy updates. Conversely elements of the plan

which involve more complex land use issues and allocating sites or safeguarding minerals banks would be more limited to the NYC area of the Plan.

- 4.4 The suggested budget includes a significant contingency for high level legal advice which NYC predict might be needed. This reflects the situation in the extended public inquiry where there was considerable debate and evidence challenge in relation to fracking and changes in national policy regarding Shale Gas. Currently hydraulic fracturing cannot legally take place directly within a Protected Landscape and so in the current political climate, any extended legal input would not be required in relation to the National Park context. Other legal costs may be required in any contextual situation relating to specific sites where exceptional evidence base costs within a particular area may also arise – again these situations are more likely to occur on mineral extraction sites outside the National Park.
- 4.5 The NYC position is that a 20% National Park apportionment is reasonable and the Management Board has already endorsed maintaining the 55/25/20 split across the three authorities. It has accepted that in the first instance the NPA commit to a budget of £150k but as work progresses, if the costs increase, it would be expected that the NPA would absorb 20% of those additional costs.

5. A Separate National Park Minerals and Waste Plan or Incorporation of Policies in the Local Plan

- 5.1 The option of undertaking a separate National Park M&WP or to incorporate Minerals and Waste policies within the Authority's new Local Plan is therefore something that should be considered. These options are available by virtue of Section 15C 10 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Informal discussions with the Yorkshire Dales have been helpful as that NPA included minerals and waste policies in its own recent Local Plan. This appears to have been a relatively light touch exercise with the Plan having only four policies relating to minerals development (Crushed Rock Quarrying, Building Stone, Re-working Mineral Waste and Mineral Safeguarding) and only a single Waste policy.
- 5.2 The NPA is due to commence the formal review of the Local Plan by notifying its intention to commence at the AGM on 29th June and an option would therefore be for us to include a set of minerals and waste policies within the Park-Wide Local Plan. This has the advantages of economies of scale in terms of cost and staff resources as there would be one single process and examination thereby saving much duplication of process. If Members agree to this option then the Notice of Intention to commence the review of the Local Plan must specify that the intention is for the Plan to also incorporate the minerals and waste plan. The separate report on the Local Plan to this Committee has included this reference to reflect the recommendation of this report – though this can be removed in the event that Members conclude a Joint Plan is the preferred way forward.
- 5.3 If Members conclude that there are clear advantages to preparing our own Minerals and Waste policies (as set out above in relation to cost and resource savings) there will still be additional costs and capacity issues which will need to be planned for. The Policy Team will be fully engaged with the Local Plan Review and also have a role in relation to the Management Plan which is due to be reviewed in 2027. The Director of Planning can provide a lead role in the preparation of policies and the

evidence gathering/scoping processes required though there is more limited minerals planning experience within the Authority following Rob Smith's retirement. Budgets will therefore have to reflect the need for external consultancy input to elements of the plan, though it is considered that there will still be very significant savings in this approach compared to being part of a much larger joint plan. Officers are already planning for these budget requirements, and part of the separate MHCLG local plan grant and elements of the RDEL funding can be allocated for this purpose.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Given the timing of the Authority's Local Plan Review and the significant cost savings that are likely to be achieved officers are of the view that the option of incorporating minerals and waste policies within our Local Plan Review is the preferred option for the Authority. This view is partly based on the fact that we are not stating at a point where there are no detailed policies as we were in 2013 and that the specific minerals policies in the Joint Plan that are relevant to the National Park provide a good basis for review.

7 Contribution to National Park Management Plan

7.1 The minerals and waste policies will dictate the scale and location of appropriate minerals and waste development and will have a role in delivering the outcomes of the Management Plan whilst protecting the National Park's Special Qualities.

8 Financial and staffing implications

8.1 The funding and staff input required to undertake a review of the existing MWJP will be challenging depending on which option is agreed, however realistic budgets can be allocated within existing budgets for the recommended option. A verbal estimate of the costs of including Minerals and Waste policies into the Authority's Local Plan which will be mainly external professional input will be provided at the Meeting.

9 Legal and Sustainability implications

9.1 As a Minerals and Waste local planning authority, the NPA is legally responsible for preparing and adopting a minerals and waste plan.

10 Recommendation

10.1 That Members:

- Assess the options for undertaking a review of the Minerals and Waste Plan based on the issues set out in this report
- Resolve to incorporate Minerals and Waste Policies as part of the new National Park Local Plan

Contact Officer:
Chris France
Director of Planning
01439 772700