

Leic C Pol/071128/SCI

28th November 2007

Director of Community Services
Leicestershire County Council – Planning Group
County Hall
Glenfield
Leicester
LE3 8TE

Dear Sir,

Ibstock Brick – Leicester MDF Further consultation, Minerals

Thank you for your letter of 17th October 2007 in connection with the above and attaching both the Minerals and Waste Spatial Strategy further consultation documents.

We thank you for the opportunity to participate at this stage of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Our comments in relation to the relevant documents are set out in separate letters, this relating to the Minerals Spatial Strategy.

In general terms we consider that the information provided gives a good overview of the industry and the geology of the mineral resource in Leicestershire. The spatial portrait is a useful document in highlighting the key social, economic, environmental and resource issues in the area and during the plan period. We do have a number of specific comments on the document and these are set out below relative to the respective headings and sections.

Transport

- The document provides a good over view of the road network in the plan area and out toward adjoining areas. Whilst the plans provide an over view of the region, it is difficult to identify the roads as they lack reference numbers.
- Page 8, 3.11 – The opening sentence of the section refers to the potential impact of transporting minerals by heavy good vehicles. The second sentence extends to the content of the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan and provides a series of bullet points highlighting the impact of traffic.

It is considered that this could lead to confusion and the suggestion that the minerals industry is responsible for the impacts. The section should be re structured to highlight that the LTP refers to all traffic and thus the bulleted list of impact is NOT specific to minerals.

Page 10 – Various mineral resources and respective transport issues are considered, however no reference is made to the brick industry. It would seem appropriate to also include a section (perhaps paragraph 3.16) highlighting the close geographical relationship between the clay reserves and brick manufacturing plant, which inherently

Serving Forticrete and Ibstock Brick

mitigates the transport issue of raw materials. This could also refer to paragraph 4.52 which highlights this relation.

- Page 10, 3.16 – Whilst we appreciate the theory of rail or water transport of clay and bricks, we believe that such policy is largely inapplicable to this particular sector. Most factories have adjoining clay reserves. The cost and price profile of clay and bricks simply do not permit the very considerable investment required by rail and water transport.

The brick industry uses a process of back loading to ensure that vehicles rarely travel empty and thus maximise their use on the road.

Use of secondary and recycled minerals

- Page 12, 4.5 – We use waste materials within the body of our product where we can, recognising controls set by local authorities or the Environment Agency.

The philosophy of utilising recycled / waste materials as raw materials is one which the brick industry has embraced. We use clay waste, waste bricks, coke breeze (a by-product), PFA, and we are experimenting currently with glass cullet.

An important barrier to the above is often the onerous requirements under Waste Management licensing which may prevent the beneficial use of waste materials of brick production.

We endeavour to use waste product in the body of our product however every brick produced requires the majority of it to comprise virgin clay. The value of brick as a vernacular building material blending with the built heritage is also an important consideration.

We believe however that the MWDF could make a valuable contribution to the prudent use of resources through encouraging the use of secondary materials arising as a by-product of clay extraction which are not suitable for brickmaking i.e. interburden. This by-product could be transported off site for use in other industry for fill, flood defence etc, thus relieving the pressure on other primary materials.

Other construction materials

- Page 19, 4.40 – The paragraph does not make sense as it lacks a direct subject matter relating globally to ‘other construction materials’. We therefore believe that this should be struck out in favour of the significant detail offered in latter sections.
- Page 20, 4.44 - We welcome the content and the reiteration of Minerals Policy Statement 1 – Brick Clay Annex, stressing the 25 years’ permitted reserve figure for each clay processing facility.
- Page 20, 4.45 – Despite the content of 4.44, paragraph 4.45 reverts to a regional view of brick clay land bank. This is incorrect and irrelevant as the land bank should refer to individual production facilities. We therefore suggest that the reference to regional land bank be deleted in order to ensure compliance with Government Guidance within MPS1, Brick Clay Annex.
- Page 21, 4.49 – We understand that comments are not sought in connection with the options referred, however comment that option B would benefit with the amendment ‘.....**within and** beyond the East Midlands.....’

Brick clay

- Page 21, 4.50 – We believe that the section would read better deleting ‘Brick clay is mainly produced by the’ and thus commencing ‘Brick Manufacturers.....’ also deleting ‘thus’ from the second line.
- Page 22, 4.52 – The second sentence is misleading in suggesting that clay around the existing sites is more valuable/important. We suggest re wording to ‘....extensive, but **resources around existing sites should be safeguarded to support the ongoing investment in the site**’.
- Page 22, 4.54 – Reference is made to other brickworks locations in the region. We feel the operations in Ibstock should therefore also be referred; highlighting that previous permission to export minerals to Ellistown will have a longer term impact on the permitted reserve through faster depletion. We would then look toward highlighting future reserve in MSA and MCA’s.
- Page 22, 4.55 – The section refers to assistance of the brick clay manufacturers in the provision of information. It continues suggesting that no sites have been promoted in the MDF. The section structure suggests no assistance has been provided in the MDF process, however we are able to demonstrate a full co operation since initial modifications to the Minerals Local Plan in 2003 through to the most recent MWDF drafting. We suggest that the section be clarified with the addition ‘**Whilst the brick industry has assisted in the above respect....**’ at the commencement of the second sentence. We also question if the phrase ‘**additional**’ is correct since it may not be necessary for additional sites but rather extensions thereto. In this respect our comments above and in the previous comment will develop with specific allocation representation at the appropriate time.

Fireclay

The section on fireclay is very useful however we believe that it could benefit in a preamble explaining the key uses of fireclay. With regard to the brick industry, we would highlight that;

- Fireclay is an important constituent in the production of certain bricks in order to produce the buff or cream effect finish to the product,
 - Unusually, much of the supply is outside of the control of the industry, with the exception of Donnington Island. The Donnington Island site provides an important resource which is partly controlled by the industry,
 - Fireclay resource is often overlooked by the desire to win coal from open cast sites, therefore the importance of fireclay safeguarding in such schemes should be highlighted and promoted.
-
- Page 26, 4.68 – We provide our overall support in the need for a longer term view of the Donnington Island site to continue operations beyond the current 2012 period. This can then facilitate the prudent use of the resources available at this long standing valuable location. The prudent use of the resource on site, some of which is of lower quality, should be supported with the blending with other materials on site and through imported product.

Energy Minerals – Coal

We believe that a short insertion reflecting the content of paragraph 4.69 would be beneficial within the coal section in order to highlight the need to safeguard fireclay during open cast coal production.

Preferred methodology for Safeguarding Mineral Resources

Page 38, 5.13 – Bullet four refers to brick clays. Whilst we support the safeguarding of reserves around existing works, consideration should remain in that reserves located in areas suitable for new manufacturing facilities should also be safeguarded.

Page 38, 5.14 – No reference is made to any buffer around Brick clay sites. In line with the other minerals, we also suggest a minimum of 200 metres.

Page 39, 5.15 – The web link to the proposals map is not provided. The only map we were able to identify was that dated 1995, which is out of date. We support the principle of safeguarding but consider that some work in the definition of the areas should take place, perhaps as part of Site Allocations.

Spatial Maps

As stated previously, we believe that improved understanding of the maps would be derived by annotation of the main road network. In addition, the place names on the map cover a considerable area of ground, for example Coalville extending out to cover the M1. We suggest the map clarity could again be improved by an arrow annotation to a dot marker representing the place name more accurately.

Once the above is complete, we would be in a better position to comment on the areas defined as clay bearing.

We hope the above is useful in assisting this stage of the Minerals Development Framework in Leicestershire and look forward to your comments.

Yours Faithfully,

Simon C Ingram BSc (Hons) MRICS AIEMA
Properties Manager – South

Leic C Pol/071128/SCI

28th November 2007

Director of Community Services
Leicestershire County Council – Planning Group
County Hall
Glenfield
Leicester
LE3 8TE

Dear Sir,

Ibstock Brick – Leicester WDF Further consultation, Waste

Thank you for your letter of 17th October 2007 in connection with the above and attaching both the Minerals and Waste Spatial Strategy further consultation documents.

We thank you for the opportunity to participate at this stage of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Our comments in relation to the relevant documents are set out in separate letters, this relating to the Waste Spatial Strategy.

In general terms we consider that the information provided gives a good overview of the industry including the location on waste processing in Leicestershire. The spatial portrait is a useful document in highlighting the key social, economic, environmental and resource issues in the area and during the plan period. We do have a number of specific comments on the document and these are set out below relative to the respective headings and sections.

Background

- Page 1, 1.1 – (MDF) should be corrected to (WDF).

Next Stages

- Page 2, 1.9 – We note that the Waste Allocations has been separated from the Core Strategy. It is stated that ‘further sites’ will be considered in 2009, suggesting that a pre determined list is developed and may be added to at that time. We respectfully suggest that this text should be clarified in that when Site Allocation documents are prepared in 2009, full opportunity will again commence for site allocations, not merely consideration of additions thereto.

Spatial Characteristics relevant to the framework area

- Page 5, 2.9 – We support the view that waste sites and particularly landfill schemes lend themselves to mineral sites. In particular, clay quarries can provide a good receptor for waste due to the naturally impermeable nature of the strata.

We also note the reference that residual waste is currently transferred outside of the Framework Area to landfill which is less sustainable in terms of transportation.

Serving Forticrete and Ibstock Brick

At the appropriate Allocations time and connected to our comments above, we would look towards assisting with our Leicester brickworks clay quarry and lands.

The spatial strategy for waste

- Page 7, 3.1 – Related to the above, we again note that current need for exportation to other authorities. The potential for waste recycling, treatment and disposal at the Leicester quarry site may assist in a more sustainable approach.
- Page 8, 3.7 – We have concerns with the content of the first sentence in the suggestion that restricting landfill capacity is a mechanism to assist recycling targets. Recycling targets should be achieved through the provision of facilities to encourage this, thus resulting in a reduction of residual waste and the need for landfill. We note the latter sentences of the paragraph on page 9 and the requirement for further landfill capacity and again refer to the potential at Leicester.

Issues and options consultation

- Page 11, 4.2 – Whilst we acknowledge we are not requested to comment on the options, the lack of definition for 'site' somewhat leaves this term open to the widest definition of waste processing and disposal facilities. We have assumed this in the rest of the text and comment as such below.
- Page 13, 4.9 – We note the result of the Entec assessment of optimal locations and highlight the strategic location of Ibstocks Leicester clay quarry and the potential importance in the future strategy. The new access road linking the Leicester site to Whitehill road provides a good access route to the motorway network, minimising traffic impact on the built environment.

Strategic Sites

- Page 17, 4.24 – We again reiterate our comments in relation to future site allocations and the need for a full review upon the commencement of such documents in 2009. This will enable sites to be promoted including the Leicester quarry and which can assist in the targets of the plan.

We hope the above is useful in assisting this stage of the Minerals Development Framework in Leicestershire and look forward to your comments.

Yours Faithfully,

Simon C Ingram BSc (Hons) MRICS AIEMA
Properties Manager – South