Please see Annex SW5 for supporting information, and the "Introduction" for Health and Safety considerations and advice on the use of the guidance.

1. Are there proposals to relocate the plant site and mineral stockpiling areas
   Where not part of the original proposals, operators should consider impacts on and make appropriate provisions for:
   a. any detrimental effects on the agreed schemes of working and restoration, and how these may be minimised
   b. any additional land being disturbed, and amendments to the agreed restored soil profiles
   c. a full justification for their proposals

2. Are there secondary facilities proposed, such as MRFs
   Where facilities such as MRFs were not part of the original proposals, operators should consider their effect on the working and restoration of the site. Temporary proposals may become permanent and also force changes to the working and restoration of the site. Operators should consider:
   a. any detrimental effects on the agreed schemes of working and restoration, and how these may be minimised
   b. any additional land being disturbed, and amendments to the agreed restored soil profiles
   c. a full justification for their proposals

For more detailed information see:
- The Reclamation of Mineral Workings to Agriculture (DoE 1996)
- Guidance on Good Practice for the Reclamation of Mineral Workings to Agriculture (DoE 1996)
- Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils (MAFF April 2000)
- MPG7 Reclamation of Mineral Workings (DoE 1996)

Cross references:
- AP 5, 7, 12
- SW 6
- RN 3, 7, 8
- AC 3, 10
1. Are there proposals to relocate the plant site and mineral stockpiling areas

If this is planned for from the very beginning, there may be minimum disruption to the site working and restoration, although the need to relocate should be clearly demonstrated at the planning application stage. Where the proposal is put forward during the life of the site, careful consideration should be given to:

a. any detrimental effects on the agreed schemes of working and restoration, and how these may be minimised
   Any effects on the phasing and restoration proposals and to the disturbance of unworked or restored land within aftercare. It is important to minimise any disruption and compromise in the agreed objectives. Relocation may result in new haul roads, which may cross unworked or restored land within aftercare, or lead to access difficulties for agricultural machinery or livestock.

b. any additional land being disturbed, and amendments to the agreed restored soil profiles
   If the relocation requires the phasing to be amended, this can necessitate changes to the restored soil profiles which may compromise the restoration objectives. This may be due to amended phase boundaries no longer mirroring the soil units to be handled separately, or because changes to the order that phases are worked means that different soil units are no longer available at the appropriate times to achieve the agreed soil profile.

c. a full justification for their proposals
   A full justification and evaluation should be carried out where changes are proposed.

2. Are there secondary facilities proposed, such as MRFs

Where facilities such as MRFs form part of the original planning application proposals, they should be properly integrated into the working and restoration of the site. However, problems can occur where such facilities are proposed subsequently, or temporary facilities are to become permanent. Operators should then consider and make appropriate provisions for:

a. any detrimental effects on the agreed schemes of working and restoration, and how these may be minimised
   Any effects on the phasing and restoration proposals, and to the disturbance of unworked or restored land within aftercare. It is important to minimise any disruption and compromise in the agreed objectives. Relocation may result in new haul roads, which may cross unworked or restored land within aftercare, or lead to access difficulties for agricultural machinery or livestock.
b. any additional land being disturbed, and amendments to the agreed
restored soil profiles
If the relocation requires the phasing to be amended, this can necessitate
changes to the restored soil profiles which may compromise the restoration
objectives. This may be due to amended phase boundaries no longer mirroring
the soil units to be handled separately, or because changes to the order that
phases are worked means that different soil units are no longer available at the
appropriate times to achieve the agreed soil profile.

c. a full justification for their proposals
A full justification and evaluation should be carried out where changes are
proposed.