

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

31 January 2017

Report of the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Communities

**DERBYSHIRE AND DERBY MINERALS LOCAL PLAN (HIGHWAYS,
TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)**

(1) **Purpose of Report** To update Cabinet on the progress of joint working with Derby City Council on developing the Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan and timescale for adoption.

(2) **Information and Analysis**

Joint Minerals Local Plan Context

All councils are required to prepare local plans. These need to be up to date and positive towards sustainable economic development. As Minerals and Waste Local Planning Authority, the County Council has a statutory duty to prepare and review minerals and waste local plans.

Joint working with the City Council on these plans is being coordinated via a member body, the Joint Local Plans Advisory Committee, with technical work lead by the County. The new Minerals Local Plan will cover all Derbyshire County, with the exception of the Peak District National Park, for the period to 2030. It will replace the existing, increasingly out of date, Minerals Plan.

The Minerals Local Plan will reflect local priorities and, from its adoption, all planning applications for minerals schemes, including large quarries and “fracking”, will be determined in accordance with it, unless specific material considerations indicate otherwise.

The minerals industry is economically important to the County and is a major supply-chain employer and generator of significant business rates. Derbyshire minerals are nationally important as key raw materials for infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods. They are, however, a finite resource and it is important that the best use of them is made to enable their long term conservation.

The County has a wealth of mineral resources including limestone, sandstone, sand and gravel, coal and specialist minerals. Derbyshire councils and the Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) Local Enterprise

Partnership (LEP) have ambitious agendas for future sustainable economic growth and the continued production of minerals is an important element in supporting this. A clear, long-term Minerals Local Plan will set out the future scale and location of mineral working whilst protecting local communities and the environment.

The Plan has to comply with the legal requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Planning Act 2008, Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012, Localism Act 2011 and Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013. The Localism Act has created the Duty with key stakeholders a legal requirement for cooperation between authorities to maximise the effectiveness of strategic policies.

Key Issues

The main issues the Plan will seek to address have evolved during its preparation as a result of changes in markets for minerals, Government policy and engagement with stakeholders. A list of issues is included at **Annex 1** of this report.

Progress to Date

Preparation of the Derbyshire Minerals Plan began in 2009 with stakeholder workshops; an Issues and Options report was published in 2010 following which, work began on developing a draft Plan. Fundamental changes to the planning system were introduced in 2012, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the abolition of regional planning guidance on strategic demand for minerals, introduction of the Duty to Co-operate and the requirement to prepare one plan, rather than a suite of development plan documents.

It was decided to restart work on a new style, single local plan and to carry out evidence gathering and on-going consultation through the publication of a series of strategy papers and background supporting evidence papers.

During 2012-14, consultation was focussed on developing a strategy for sand and gravel, including community consultation in areas most likely to be affected by proposals for sand and gravel working, and the publication of a Local Aggregates Assessment for Derbyshire.

Between 2015 and June 2016, extensive consultation has taken place involving the publication of 20 strategy documents and their background papers relating to specific minerals and other local plan related issues. A summary schedule of consultation is set out at Annex 2.

A total of 326 comments were received from individuals and organisations. These are summarised at Annex 3.

The County and City councils are currently consulting on a number of papers about 'hard rock' quarry sites that are being promoted for working by operators during the Plan (up to 2030) period. This consultation ends on 29 January 2017. After this stage, all the comments received so far will be taken into account in preparing a Draft Minerals Plan.

Likely Content/Scope of the Draft Plan

Notwithstanding delays to submission of a Draft Plan due to national and regional policy and legislative changes, the approach of "front loading" consultation means that work can now progress quickly. The Draft Plan will set out a proposed approach to minerals extraction and will include full justification of how this was developed. A proposed, indicative structure and outline content for the Plan is set out at Annex 4.

Next Steps/Timetable

An indicative timetable for the next stages of the Plan preparation is set out below. This may alter as a result of the very late request for the inclusion of a very large building stone quarry site in Darley Dale.

Towards a Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18)	Publish Spring - Summer 2017
Publication of Draft Plan (Regulation 19)	Winter 2017
Submission of Plan (Regulation 22)	Spring 2018 (Cabinet approval req)
Examination in Public (Regulation 24)	Autumn 2018 (Planning Inspectorate (PINS) dependent)
Adoption (Regulation 26)	PINS dependent

(3) **Legal Considerations** The continuing development and preparation of the Draft Minerals Plan and subsequent submission Minerals Local Plan will be undertaken in full accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Planning Act 2008, Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012, Localism Act 2011 and Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013.

(4) **Environmental Considerations** The County and City councils have a statutory responsibility to prepare a Minerals Local Plan that supports sustainable economic development. The policies and proposals contained in the Draft and Final versions of the Plan will seek to balance environmental considerations whilst promoting economic development.

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: financial, legal, prevention of crime and disorder, equality and diversity, human resources, environmental, health, property, social value and transport considerations.

(5) **Key Decision** Yes.

(6) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

(7) **Background Papers** Held on file within the Economy, Transport and Communities Department. Officer contact details – Rob Murfin, extension 39777.

(7) **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS** That Cabinet resolves to note the progress in the preparation of the new Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan that is detailed in this report and the indicative timescale set out in this report for the next stages in its preparation.

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Communities

ANNEX 1

Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan - Key Issues

This is a list of the key issues that have been identified and which will be addressed through the Minerals Local Plan.

Sustainable Provision of Minerals

1. Maintaining Derbyshire and Derby's position as a leader in UK mineral production supporting economic growth and the creation of jobs and skills.
2. Providing a steady and adequate supply of minerals. Determining the need and requirement for each mineral over the Plan period, including the specific provision of aggregate minerals determined through a Local Aggregate Assessment. From this, indicating sites which can be delivered to meet any identified shortfall in need over the Plan period.
3. Developing policies which ensure that minerals provision meets the requirements of sustainable development to help stimulate the economy and create jobs, whilst also seeking to deliver benefits to local communities and protecting areas of important landscape, heritage and ecological assets.
4. Developing policies to address the issue of cumulative impact of development on communities and areas.
5. Continuing to encourage and promote the increased use of recycled and secondary aggregates to help achieve a reduction in the use of primary aggregates.

Cross Boundary Working

6. Under the Duty to Cooperate provision, working in partnership with relevant authorities and other stakeholders to ensure that a coordinated cross boundary approach is taken to mineral development.
7. Helping to achieve a progressive reduction in mineral extraction from the Peak District National Park.

Safeguarding

8. Safeguarding important minerals to ensure they are not sterilised by other development and therefore are protected for longer term supply for future generations.
9. Safeguarding minerals related infrastructure to ensure it is taken into account when assessing proposals for non-mineral development on the site.

Energy Minerals

10. Developing policies and proposals to help achieve greater security of energy supply. Industry will therefore be seeking to discover and exploit accessible reserves of energy minerals (oil, gas and coal). In this respect, there is further potential for coal

extraction in Derbyshire. There may also be some potential for gas extraction and this may involve to some extent the consideration of hydraulic fracturing technologies to extract gas from deep shale resources, mainly in the east of the county.

Restoration

11. Ensuring that high quality restoration of mineral workings is carried out with schemes agreed at the outset of the development to secure benefits for the site and the local community for the long term.
12. Developing a strategic approach for the future working and subsequent environmental/economic restoration of sand and gravel sites in the Trent Valley and for hard rock quarries.

Climate Change

13. Through site allocations and policies, reducing the carbon footprint of mineral development by minimising distance that the mineral is transported and taking into account the overall impact that climate change has on flooding of low lying areas of the river valleys.

ANNEX 2

Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan – Progress so Far

March 2009

Plan preparation began. Authorities informed all stakeholders of process and initial issues. Explanatory notes to all groups and individuals on the authorities' mailing list. Total of 37 replies were received. Issues raised in the responses used to inform development of the spring 2010 Issues and Options Paper.

September 2009

Key issues workshops held to gather stakeholder's views on what should be included in the Plan. Total of 74 representatives attended from a wide variety of organisations.

April 2010

Issues and Options Report and Evidence-Based Papers were published. Total of 51 organisations and individuals responded to consultation, providing over 150 separate comments on various aspects of the Issues and Options report.

Late 2012

Drop-in sessions held in nine communities which could be affected by proposals for future sand and gravel extraction in the Trent, Derwent and Dove Valleys. Development of emerging Trent Valley Strategy and first Local Aggregate Assessment for the Plan area.

2013 - 2014

Period of continuous consultation involving meetings with mineral operators, other local authorities and stakeholders in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. Evidence gathering to develop further the evidence base for the Plan, taking account of the major revisions to Government planning policy in NPPF and NPPG, which were published in 2012. Strategy and Supporting Papers were prepared for the next consultation phase.

March 2015 – June 2016

Rolling consultation engaged the wider community of Derbyshire and Derby in developing the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Minerals Local Plan. Invited comments and suggestions on elements of the Plan through a series of consultation strategy papers and their respective supporting papers. Extensive information regarding consultation available on Derbyshire and Derby websites. 326 separate representations.

Present

Taking account of comments that were received during the rolling consultation, we are now drafting the chapters of the Plan and amending the supporting papers. In addition to this, a proposal for a new quarry at Bent Lane was submitted in November 2016. We are currently running a public consultation regarding this proposal for an eight week period until 29 January 2017.

ANNEX 3

DERBYSHIRE AND DERBY MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS TO THE 2015/2016 CONSULTATION

OCTOBER 2016

Introduction

This rolling consultation began in April 2015. A number of strategy and related supporting papers have been published, which set out the emerging approach for various elements of the Minerals Local Plan. These were added to during late 2015 and early 2016 and responses continued to be invited on all papers until 3 July 2016.

This report provides a summary of the number and content of these responses. 57 people and organisations have provided a total of 339 written comments. 13 of these people/organisations have also completed various parts of the on line questionnaire. The summaries of these written and questionnaire responses below are by topic, as set out in the consultation.

Spatial Portrait (Supporting Paper)

There have been 5 comments made by 3 respondents to this part of the Plan.

- Two asked for more general background information on the Derbyshire minerals industry to be included in the Plan.
- One asked for reference to be made to the National Forest.
- Include a sentence stating that the stunning landscapes coincide with the existence of minerals.

Vision and Objectives (Supporting Paper)

12 comments have been received from 3 individuals/organisations.

- All of these provide advice on the content of the vision and objectives, according to the respondents' area of expertise.

Strategic Sustainability Principles

Written Responses

There have been 33 comments on this paper from eight individuals and organisations.

- Eight of these comments support the policies as drafted.
- Policy SMP2 is too inflexible. It should provide exceptions/qualifications. It should also provide greater detail on causes of climate change
- Policy SMP3 should distinguish between levels of environmental designation and make reference to the historic environment. It should also be more explicit about the use of recycled aggregates.
- Policy SMP1 should emphasise the potential for restored sites to provide environmental enhancement and should place equal emphasis on all sustainability principles not just economic.
- Policy SMP4 is considered too inflexible regarding recycled aggregates.

- The others offer various amounts of advice and suggestions as to how the policies should be reworded or provide additional/revised wording according to the respondents' area of interest.

Aggregate Crushed Rock

Written Responses

There have been 15 comments on this paper from 9 individuals/organisations. These are the main issues that have been raised:

- There is general agreement that new proposals for crushed rock should be restricted, other than in exceptional circumstances of public benefit.
- Opinion is divided as to whether operators should be asked to relinquish reserves in return for new proposals.
- One comment expresses concern that the landbank of over 100 years is misleading since end dates of most permissions are around 2042, so the certain landbank is only considered to be 27 years.
- Concern is also expressed that the text is weighted too much towards economic need rather than giving full consideration to the range of sustainability principles and that greater emphasis should be placed on protection of the environment, both natural and historic.
- One operator argues that any policy should be flexible enough to allow for extensions to existing sites and disagrees that these should only be modest sites that do not increase the landbank significantly.
- Others argue that, because of the large landbank, extensions or new sites should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
- One operator objects to a policy requirement that local benefits should be provided in order to make a proposal acceptable, stating that there are environmental benefits from extensions in any case.
- One comment calls for increased transport of aggregate by rail rather than road. Revised and/or additional wording is offered or suggested to address these concerns.
- Other MPAs support the approach of Derbyshire maintaining supplies to other parts of the country.

Questionnaire Responses

There was also one response to the questionnaire which supported Option 2 (To only permit new proposals for crushed rock if there are social or environmental benefits from the proposal).

Helping to Reduce Quarrying in the Peak District National Park

Written Responses

There have been 11 responses to this paper from 6 respondents.

- Whilst most support the overall aim of helping to reduce in quarrying of aggregate in the Peak Park over time, this is tempered by concerns relating to whether this would

lead to a significant increase in quarrying in Derbyshire and the resulting environmental and social impacts.

- One particular area of concern is around Rowsley, where it is feared new quarries would open/re-open to compensate for those closing in the adjoining Peak Park.
- One comment sets out that the MPA must have evidence that the resources are interchangeable; if there are unique resources in the Peak Park this should be addressed.
- One comment suggests that the policy should also cover building stone not just aggregates and therefore that Derbyshire should increase its supply of building stone.
- Amendments and additions to wording to this policy are also suggested.

Questionnaire Responses

There have been 4 responses to the questionnaire; 1 supported the proposed approach and three were unsure.

Sand & Gravel

Written Responses

8 individuals or organisations responded and together made a total of 8 comments to this paper.

- Two of these question the method by which the provision figures have been calculated, suggesting that the figure should be higher, using the previous SRA figure until a robust forecast methodology has been developed and to include an element of flexibility. Concerned, therefore, about under provision over the course of the Plan period.
- Equally, support is expressed for the provision figure.
- The Plan should indicate that production can be maintained at more than 1mtpa.
- One comment of support is expressed for the proposal to favour extensions to existing sites over new ones.
- Concern is expressed for opening up sites in the Lower Dove Valley and also around Repton where the road network would not be considered suitable for heavy lorries.

Questionnaire Responses

Three individuals completed the on line questionnaire, responses being split equally between supporting and not supporting the emerging approach and being unsure.

Sand and Gravel Site Assessment Methodology (Supporting Paper)

10 comments have been received to the site assessment methodology from 5 organisations.

- One states that preference should be given to extensions
- One states that there should be no new sites allocated
- Modifications should be made to the scoring system
- The quality of the resource should be included as a criteria
- Concern is expressed over consideration of cross border environmental assets.
- The assessments should include a criteria to consider the loss of sports facilities.

- Soil surveys should be undertaken to determine the quality of the soil.
- One expresses support for the exclusion of low scoring sites

Sand and Gravel Site Assessments (Supporting Paper)

13 comments have been received from 9 respondents.

- 1 operator supports the allocations at Swarkestone and Elvaston and suggests their potential should be regarded to medium/high.
- 2 individuals object to the allocation at Swarkestone South
- 1 objects to an allocation at Egginton
- There are 2 comments about Chapel Farm
- 1 individual objects to proposed allocation at Repton/Foremark
- Staffs CC provide a comment on the ecologic value of the Willington site.
- The rest offer suggestions for how the sites should be worked and restored should the allocations proceed

Trent Valley Strategy and Methodology

Written Responses

There have been 24 comments from 11 individuals or organisations to this part of the Plan. (4 of these are to the methodology paper)

- Four support the proposed approach.
- Three express concern that the Environmental Sensitivity Mapping excludes national environmental designations from its analysis.
- One asks for the strategy to coordinate with the Central Rivers Initiative for the Trent and Tame Valleys.
- The RSPB document “Bigger and Better” should be taken into account in the Strategy.
- It should be coordinated with the CRI strategy so that it links with neighbouring areas.
- More general comments relate to wording and the consistency of the strategy with the sand and gravel strategy.

Questionnaire Responses

Eight people completed the questionnaire for this part of the Plan. Seven of these supported the proposed approach and one was unsure.

Four responses were received to the question of whether the sensitivity work should inform the site selection methodology for sand and gravel sites. One agreed, two did not and one was unsure.

Industrial Limestone

Written Responses

There have been 36 comments (25 on the Strategy paper and 11 on the supporting paper) submitted by 8 individuals/organisations.

- The three operators that proposed extensions to their quarries at Whitwell, Ashwood Dale and Brassington Moor supported their allocation in the Plan.
- One respondent supported the recognition that industrial minerals are scarce resources in need of safeguarding from unnecessary sterilisation from non-mineral development.
- One respondent supported the requirement to maximise the use of industrial limestone for those purposes and acceptance that where limestone cannot be used for industrial purposes it can be used for construction purposes.
- One respondent supported the recognition of the resource at Whitwell as being nationally important.
- One respondent supported the Duty to Co-operate working taking place on issues at Whitwell Quarry.
- One respondent was concerned about the proposed extensions to Whitwell Quarry in relation to the need to protect Creswell Crags from future mineral working especially in view of its potential for World Heritage status.
- One respondent stressed the importance of taking into account the impact of mineral extraction on historic and other environmental assets both in any emerging policies and in the assessment of any proposed allocations.
- One respondent thought it was misleading to refer to the level of permitted industrial limestone reserves within the whole Plan area and suggested that the level of reserves at individual active quarries should be included in the Plan.
- One respondent argued it was misleading to use the term 'landbanks' when referring to industrial limestone reserves; the phrase 'stock of permitted reserves' should be used as per the NPPF.
- Amendments and additions to wording are also suggested.

Questionnaire Responses

- There have been 5 responses to Issue 1 about the way in which the Plan should make provision for the future supply of industrial limestone; 4 supported Option 3 which was to make provision through existing permitted reserves, allocations and a criteria based policy and 1 supported the Option 2 which was to rely on existing permitted reserves and a criteria based policy only.
- There were 4 responses to Issue 2; which was about the components of a criteria based policy. One suggested that the policy should include environmental protection including heritage. One agreed that it was reasonable for the need to work that particular mineral to require justification; two suggested it was too onerous to require both justification of need and maximisation of recovery to meet that need.
- There were 4 responses to Issue 3; two required the heritage impacts of the suggested sites for working to be properly taken into account. Particular mention was made of the need to protect Creswell Crags from any future working. Two respondents supported specific allocations that had been put forward. One

respondent questioned the need for any allocations in view of the current level of permitted reserves.

- There were three responses to Issue 4; there was general consent for the requirement for sufficient evidence to be submitted in support of any proposed site to enable a proper evaluation of the site to take place in relation to its need, deliverability and impacts on the environment and communities.
- There were two responses to Issue 5; both supported the approach of a separate policy for the supply of raw materials for cement production. One added the need to include environmental criteria in any policy.

Hard Rock Quarries Potential Allocations Site Assessment Methodology

(Supporting Paper)

- There have been 3 responses from 1 respondent about the Site Assessment Criteria used relating to the weighting of criteria, potential mitigation measures and the thresholds chosen for several criteria e.g. noise and dust.

Building Stone

Written Responses

There have been 12 comments from 5 individuals or organisations.

- Two of these comments support the approach proposed.
- One disagrees with the assumption made that future need for building stone is impossible to predict.
- One considers the proposed approach too restrictive in terms of the level of production that would be permitted and in terms of the sale of aggregate from sites as a by-product.
- One suggests that the policy should recognise that the market for building stone changes over time and that it should encompass the whole of the UK.
- One suggests that the policy should recognise that building stone is required for uses other than maintaining character of buildings and settlements.
- One suggests that the policy should coordinate with that for reducing quarrying in the Peak Park.
- One suggests that the resources map should indicate the presence of building stone resources around Hardwick Hall.
- A site at Bent Lane, Darley Dale is put forward as a proposed allocation.

Questionnaire Responses

3 people completed the questionnaire relating to building stone. Two of these express support for the approach proposed of making future provision through a criteria policy rather than allocations, and one does not.

Seven comments were also made on the building stone supporting paper by one respondent. These relate to interpretation of national policy, the often high percentage of reject stone which could be used as aggregate, the fact that stone can be transported beyond the local area for processing and the interpretation of what national policy means by “small scale” and therefore whether the policy should stipulate that building stone quarries should be small scale.

Safeguarding Mineral Resources

Written Responses

There have been 35 responses to this paper from 12 individuals or organisations.

- There is overall support for the approach as proposed and for the minerals which are proposed to be safeguarded.
- One comment suggests that the high grade industrial element of the Permian Limestone should be safeguarded separately to distinguish them from the aggregate grade mineral.
- Three consider that safeguarding of building stone should not be as restrictive and it should cover all the resource. One of these refers also to clays and Sherwood sandstone
- Most agree that urban areas should be washed over but one considers it impractical except for shallow coal or sand and gravel.
- One asks whether the policy can safeguard non designated minerals for example on the line of proposed HS2.
- It is suggested that there may be cases where deep coal could be safeguarded so as not to conflict with sensitive surface land development.
- The opinion regarding the definition of buffer zones is split. The MPA states that we should build the buffers into the MSAs in accordance with good practice rather than use the MCA. It is also stated by others that there should be no set buffer zones but that they should be determined on a case by case basis and only where absolutely necessary.
- Policy should clarify who makes the judgement on the implications of working within MSAs.
- Support is expressed for the exempt categories of development but to include also applications for Listed Building consent.
- There are other comments requesting wording changes.

Questionnaire Responses

Six people completed this part of the questionnaire. Three comment on and agree on the extent to which the minerals should be safeguarded. Three commented on the proposed approach, with two agreeing and one being unsure.

Safeguarding Minerals Infrastructure

There have been 3 comments from 1 respondent to this strategy.

- There should be a blanket approach to safeguarding all minerals infrastructure.

- Support definition of MCAs around sites on a site by site basis
- Policies should be flexible to allow for change i.e. if facilities are removed.

Clay

Written Responses

There have been 4 responses to this strategy document from 3 respondents

- One supports the recognition of the importance of extraction at Mouselow for Denton Brickworks

Questionnaire Responses

- Two people completed the questionnaire regarding the issue of how best to make provision for the future supply of clay. One supported the option of making future provision through permitted reserves and specific allocations; one supported the option of making provision through permitted reserves, specific allocations and a criteria based policy.
- One respondent completed the questionnaire regarding the specific sites that have been put forward by operators for allocation in the Plan. They were in support of the allocation of land at Mouselow quarry for additional working.

Surface Mined Coal

Written Responses

37 responses have been received from 7 individuals or organisations to the various issues presented in this paper.

- Four respondents support the option of identifying the shallow coal resource and listing the constraints to coal mining development to assess any future proposals for extraction.
- There is support shown for the option of not identifying surface mining constraint areas in the Plan.
- Respondents agree that the proposed sustainable principles for coal extraction are correct and should be related to NPPF.
- There is support for a general policy for cumulative impacts covering all minerals rather than there also being a separate one for coal.

Questionnaire Responses

Thirty three responses were received to the ten questions in the questionnaire relating to surface mined coal. These generally support the proposed approach and reflect the support for the various options as indicated above.

Deep Mined Coal

Written Responses

8 responses have been received from 3 individuals or organisations regarding this paper.

- There is support for not including a specific policy for deep mined coal extraction.

- There is overall agreement that national policy should be sufficient to deal with applications for deep mined coal.

Questionnaire Responses

This part of the questionnaire was completed by three individuals/organisations. Two do not support the inclusion of a specific policy for deep mined coal and one does.

Hydrocarbons

Written Responses

32 comments have been received from 17 individuals/organisations to this strategy paper.

- 3 of these support the approach set out in the paper
- One states that there should not be a separate policy for hydraulic fracturing; one policy covering hydrocarbons should be sufficient.
- The remainder are all concerned about the impact that hydraulic fracturing would have on the environment

Cumulative Impacts

Written Responses

3 responses have been received from 3 individuals or organisations regarding this issue.

- The main concern raised is that it highlights the negative effects of mineral extraction without balancing the arguments out by discussing the positive effects which mineral production can have.
- One sets out that cumulative impacts should be just one consideration in the assessment of planning applications.

Questionnaire Responses

Two people completed the part of the questionnaire regarding this issue. One supported the approach proposed whilst the other was unsure.

Restoration

There have been 5 responses from 5 organisations to this strategy paper.

- There is general support for the approach but with some amendments/additions put forward.
- The benefits of green infrastructure should be referred to and incorporated into the strategy.
- There should be no requirement for a restoration guarantee bond.
- Reference should be made to natural features which it is suggested should be incorporated into restoration schemes

Restoration Strategy for Carboniferous Limestone Quarries

There has been 1 response from 1 respondent to this strategy paper.

- Support for Option 1 which is to restrict the area of the study to the A515 quarries only.

Transport

There has been 1 response from 1 respondent to this strategy paper.

- Support for the proposed policy approach but with a request for greater clarity regarding the type of information that would be required relating to mineral resources and markets.

Duty to Co-operate (Supporting Paper)

There have been 4 responses from 2 respondents to this supporting paper.

- Two responses supported the approach that the Councils propose to adopt to plan for issues with strategic cross-boundary impacts.
- Two responses requested additional references to be included in the cross boundary issues identified.

General Comments

There have been 9 general comments from 5 respondents.

- There should be greater reference to the historic environment through the Plan. Each comment refers to a different aspect of the Plan.
- Reference should be made to the National Forest
- The Local Nature Partnership objectives should be incorporated into the Plan.

ANNEX 4

PROPOSED CONTENT OF THE DRAFT PLAN

1. Introduction
2. Spatial Characteristics of the Plan area
3. Vision and Strategic Objectives
4. Core Policies

❖ ***Overarching Sustainability Principles for the Plan***

- ❖ ***Spatial Strategy for Mineral Extraction*** – indication of where minerals will come from broadly. Providing for an adequate supply of Aggregates – Apportionments to 2030 incl. landbanks.

Supply of Aggregates (future provision and location of sites)

- ❖ Secondary & Recycled Aggregates
- ❖ Sand & Gravel
- ❖ Crushed Rock
- ❖ Helping to reduce the supply of aggregates from the Peak Park

Supply of Non-Aggregates

- ❖ Building & Roofing Stone
- ❖ Industrial limestone
- ❖ Brickclay
- ❖ Fireclay
- ❖ Vein Minerals

Supply of Energy Minerals

- ❖ Coal
- ❖ Conventional (Oil and Gas) and Unconventional Hydrocarbons (Shale Gas)

Supply of Other minerals

Borrow Pits
Reworking of Former spoil tips
Incidental Working of Clay
Mineral Related Development

Minerals Safeguarding

- ❖ Mineral Resources
- ❖ Minerals Related Infrastructure

Restoration Strategies

- ❖ Trent Valley Strategy
- ❖ Hard Rock Strategy

5. Development Management Policies
To include those relating to climate change, design, nature conservation, archaeology, environmental impact and mitigation, flooding, groundwater, transport, cumulative impact
6. Monitoring and Implementation