

Summary of Responses from Issues and Options Consultation

**Leicestershire
Minerals
Development
Framework
(LMDF)**

Responses on Issues and Options

Table 1 lists all those who responded to the consultation exercise and their comments. A response, where appropriate, is only provided in Table 1, where additional comments are made to the identification of preferred options from the choices provided in the Issues and Options report. The pattern of preferred options as identified within the responses received and a commentary on the outcome is set out in Table 2.

Table 1

Ref. No.	Individual or Organisation	Summary of Comments	Response
1	Cllr Poulter, Lutterworth Town Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
2	Carlton Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
3	Stathern Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified. After opencast mining why not use the site for landfill.	Where appropriate, and where a need is identified such an option will be considered.
4	English Heritage	The assessment of historic assets and landscape character should be used to inform the selection of sites for mineral extraction. ODPM published Planning for the Supply of Natural Building and Roofing Stone in England and Wales. Study highlights the need to protect and secure sources of stone needed for building conservation purposes. One recommendation is to designate 'heritage quarries'.	Designated sites of historic and landscape character will be protected from adverse development. Leicestershire has no quarries that produce building stone.
5	Derbyshire County Council	Support the objective of the Leicestershire MDF to make sufficient provision in Leicestershire of aggregate minerals to meet recognised national and regional requirements. To take this into account when considering options for the supply of aggregate minerals.	Noted. This will be a key concern when proposals for mineral extraction are submitted.
6	Mr and Mrs Hancock	Preferred Options are identified. Sand and Gravel Issue 1 – without knowing the potential additional capacity at Lockington and	Both sites have been put forward to the Council and their potential is now known.

		<p>Brooksby it is not possible to determine how many additional years' supply could be met by such extensions.</p> <p>Sand and Gravel Issue 2 – given the length of the planning period and the uncertainty of future potential from existing site extensions, it may be necessary to develop one or more new sites. In the previous MLP, the Council opted to include future sites that were requested by landowners. Whilst this was expedient in that landowners were not likely to object to the inclusion of their site in the Plan, it did mean that selection was random and not based on all the criteria embedded in the Planning Process. Future new sites should be identified by the Council and should meet all necessary criteria before inclusion in the plans.</p> <p>Restoration Issue 1 – the prospect of a period of backfilling roughly equivalent to the period of extraction with a potential doubling of traffic and site activity is very daunting to those affected.</p>	<p>The Council does not have the expertise to identify sites economically viable for mineral extraction. Industry does and puts sites forward which the Council then decides whether, in planning terms, are suitable.</p> <p>The Council will seek restoration to be completed as quickly as possible without detriment to the quality of the restoration.</p>
7	Mr and Mrs Hartley	Preferred Options are identified.	
8	Tilton Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified. The format for the issues and options did not allow the author to keep a record of options chosen.	Noted.
9	Twyford and Thorpe Satchville Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
10	Central Networks	Would like to maintain a passive role. Will be able to provide adequate supplies of electricity to sites.	Noted.
11	Confederation of UK Coal Producers (CoalPro)	Preferred Options are identified.	
12	East Midlands Regional Assembly	Overall encouraging to see that RWS has been taken into account. This document contains no reference to the RSS minerals policies or the role of the RAWP in apportioning minerals/aggregates production. This is a major omission. Discussion of the MDF's	Noted. Comments noted and such references are now made in the document.

		compliance with the RSS minerals policy and any areas of contention between the two would have been appreciated.	
13	Lowerby and Cold Newton Parish Meeting	Preferred Options are identified.	
14	Northamptonshire County Council	It is noted that the intention is to have this DF only go to the year 2016. Although this is in line with the Structure Plan and MPG6 dates, it is not in line with PPS12. This states in paragraph 2.14 that 'the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years from the date of adoption' and that the core strategy should aim to look ahead to any longer-term time horizon which is set out in the relevant RSS.	Noted and the time period is now extended to 2021 in line with PPS12.
15	Aggregate Industries	Having regard to issues of sand and gravel, wish to promote the development of a sand and gravel site at North Kilworth.	Noted.
16	Melton Borough Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
17	Cossington Residents Action Committee	Preferred Options are identified.	
18	Ennstone Johnston Ltd.	Preferred Options are identified. Cloud Hill and Breedon are the only two quarries extracting limestone in Leicestershire. Cloud Hill is the major producing unit supplying in excess of 1 million tonnes per annum. Breedon is lower and capped at 500,000 tonnes per annum. Consequently the potential to meet the requirements of the County to 2016, it will not be possible to sustain the annual requirement for limestone without considering the release of additional resources at Cloud Hill.	In overall terms there is sufficient provision but account has been taken of any circumstances which affect production capacity.
19	The Coal Authority	Preferred Options are identified.	
20	Hanson Building Products	Preferred Options are identified.	
21	English Nature	Preferred Options are identified. English Nature's position to:	Noted.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage aggregate industry’s active involvement in community strategies and the BAP process • Emphasise need for EA, for early and continued consultation over mineral developments • Continue to oppose mineral developments that will significantly impact on SSSIs and Natura 2000 sites. Seek full mitigation, revocation or alternative outcomes to minimise impacts whilst working and secure nature conservation after. • Recommends use of appropriately strong conditions on permissions that may damage nature conservation sites • Seek to prevent or confine the pollution of soil, air and water arising from mineral working and processing. • Monitor and evaluate progress achieved as a result of advocacy of the principles and policies outlined. <p>It is beyond English Nature’s scope to recommend that one option is better than another. Findings of the SEA should determine which is the most sustainable. Advises that the County Council requires restoration plans for all applications that will restore quarry sites etc. Particular emphasis should be placed in working towards plans such as those laid out in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP.</p>	<p>Policy 40 will require restoration plans to be submitted with proposals and have regard to local plans.</p>
22	The National Forest Company	<p>National Forest takes its lead from PPS 7 which states that “local planning authorities should have regard to the National Forest in preparing Local Development Documents and in deciding planning applications”. The Government endorsed National Forest Strategy 2004-14 and strongly advocated the restoration of mineral worked sites to “Forest-related uses” in the Forest area. Nature conservation, recreation, sports and public access should also be considered in</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Where appropriate sites in the National Forest boundary will be restored to woodland.</p>

		<p>restoration schemes. The NFC thinks priority should be given to restoration to “Forest-related uses” in the National Forest area.</p> <p>NFC favours long-term site management for a minimum of 10 years but preferably longer.</p> <p>A policy condition should also be attached which puts the onus on the mineral operator/site owner to secure the ultimate long-term management of the site, either by managing the land themselves or by handing over the site to an appropriate third party.</p> <p>The text in the glossary of terms would be better amended to “The National Forest aims to create a new Forest for the nation across 200 square miles of Leicestershire, Derbyshire and Staffordshire. It is enhancing the landscape and wildlife habitats, creating a major recreation and tourism resource, helping to stimulate the local economy and involving local people in its creation”.</p>	<p>Responses from the Issues and Options consultation indicate respondents prefer 5 yr or flexible terms for management.</p> <p>Sites will receive the statutory aftercare period of 5 years.</p> <p>Glossary amended to “A new forest being established across 200 square miles of Leicestershire, Derbyshire and Staffordshire.”</p>
23	Tarmac Ltd.	Preferred Options are identified.	
24	Mr K. J. Garratt	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p> <p>Mineral development and infill are part of the environmental factors of production. So we must place emphasis on leaving things as we find them quickly. Leicestershire is well placed in mineral deposits and restrictions should be few in order to make the most of our assets.</p>	<p>Restrictions on mineral extraction in the MDF are there to ensure that it occurs in the right place and not to the detriment of society.</p>
25	Ibstock Brick Ltd	<p>In response to brick clay issue 1:</p> <p>Whilst at a County level there is a crude balance between permitted reserves of clay and perceived demand based on current usage rates over the period 2001-2016 notice should be taken of the current consultation by ODPM upon Annex 2 to MPS1 which relates exclusively to brick clay. In particular the sections headed ‘Supply of Brick Clay’ and ‘Supply of</p>	<p>Appropriate landbanks will be sustained for individual brickworks.</p>

		Brick Clays for specialist Construction Markets' which clearly confirms the needs of individual brickworks should be addressed in MDFs/LDDs. These options seek to address the regional context for brick manufacture. This should be a matter for the RSS in the first instance, not the MDF.	
26	GVA Grimley on behalf of Jelson Ltd	Preferred options are identified. Wish to be consulted on all future stages.	Noted.
27	British Ceramic Confederation	Preferred Options are identified.	
28	Heaton Planning on behalf of George Walker	Response not directly linked to Minerals Framework.	Response recorded in WDF.
29	Heaton Planning on behalf of Lafarge Aggregates UK.	Having regard to issues of sand and gravel, wish to promote additional sand and gravel areas at Brooksby Quarry.	Noted.
30	Heaton Planning on behalf of P.Winterton	Response not directly linked to Minerals Framework.	Response recorded in WDF.
31	Heaton Planning on behalf of UK Coal Mining Ltd.	In respect to meeting demand for coal the Company has previously indicated the desire to discuss forward plans for coal mining operations in Leicestershire. In regard to the coal issue options A and B are supported by UK Coal. Option C more or less maintains the current situation and provides little certainty for industry or local communities over future working. Option A can be carried forward through an appropriate proposals map backed up with suitably worded supporting text and policies.	Such a meeting has taken place. Noted. Noted.
32	Mr Houghton	Preferred options are identified. Existing major road infrastructure is critical in siting new mineral extractions and that the long term view of such developments is taken. In more sensitive environmental locations it would be necessary to consider extension of the existing canal system or re-instating the railway network rather than putting in new roads where roads are inadequate or non-existent.	Policy 32 will aim to reduce the reliance on road transportation.

33	Leicestershire Footpath Association	<p>Large sites create long tortuous diversion routes thus discouraging use of the path. We would wish to see provision made to retain existing footpaths across large quarry sites.</p> <p>For essential small diversions we would like conditions imposed for eventual re-instatement close to that of the original route with modified contours. This should be part of the conditions imposed upon the quarry and should not rely on any new use of the site after the cessation of quarry activity.</p> <p>Planning applications for large quarry operations should also offer some improvement to the rights of way network with the creation of new definitive paths especially in areas where there is need to create path links.</p>	Policy 33 will aim to protect/improve the PROW network.
34	Highways Agency	<p>From the Highways Agency's prospective the same requirements apply to each differing mineral, these are,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site selected either new or an expansion of an existing location must make every effort to reduce the need to travel and where this is not possible either use non road based modes or limit the impact by routing vehicles via the most suitable routes. • Care should be taken when selecting sites to ensure that the impact on the highway network is kept to an absolute minimum. • Continue to consult with the Highways Agency at every stage in the allocation process. <p>The Highways Agency is keen to support initiatives that help reduce the impact on the highway network due to the transportation of minerals and the waste generated by there extraction and as such is keen to be kept informed of future developments.</p>	<p>Policy 32 will seek this.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
35	Swithland Parish Meeting	Preferred Options are identified.	
36	Cotesbach Parish	Preferred Options are identified.	

	Council		
37	Viridor Waste Management Ltd	<p>Preferred Options are identified. Generally a good document. SA should be more decisive; it is only interim and change would demonstrate a dynamic process is underway.</p> <p>Would like to have seen some info on recycled aggregate.</p> <p>Industrial estates are not going to be economically sustainable for recycled materials operations and will have economic constraints. Existing mineral sites would already be doing it.</p> <p>Need to acknowledge on site processing during demolition and redevelopment.</p> <p>Local self-sufficiency in bricks and clay manufacture should be the goal.</p> <p>Restore sites with no steer as it provides flexibility. Greater than 5 years should be subject of negotiation and legal agreement.</p> <p>ODPM's consultation paper on annexes to MPS 1 is promoting a calculation for aggregates different to that set out in Issue and Options.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Data on recycled aggregates is collated at a regional level and does not currently exist at a local level. Industrial estates are suitable for some operations.</p> <p>Policy 4 recognises this.</p> <p>Council has taken this stance.</p> <p>Noted. Draft MPS1 promoted calculation now used.</p>
38	Quarry Products Association	Preferred Options are identified.	
39	Glenfield Parish Council	<p>The consultation does not make sense. It is designed for the initiated by the initiated and does not give sufficient opportunity to take an active part. Believe in active consultation, but only where it is meaningful and provides for informed opinion.</p> <p>Several questions do not make sense.</p>	Noted. Attempts will be made to make the preferred options stage easier to read and participate in.
40	Fisher German on behalf of Mrs Hopkins	Response not directly linked to Minerals Framework.	Response recorded in WDF.
41	Hepworth Building Products Ltd.	Preferred Options are identified.	
42	Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p> <p>Sites previously put forward for inclusion in the plan should be included for consideration.</p>	Noted.

43	Thrussington Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified. Ensure disruption to residents is kept to a minimum when extraction being undertaken.	Policy 38 seeks to ensure proposals contain mitigation for operations.
44	Somerby Parish Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
45	Mrs A Hampson	Preferred Options are identified. Comments on Sand and Gravel Issues – the region's need for sand and gravel is met by existing sites and their extensions for a number of years. This allows time for careful selection of further suitable sites should this be necessary which must be within the framework of attention to the environment, transportation and traffic, water issues etc. The selection of new suitable sites using the criteria above should only take place once the need for new sites is established not, as with the previous MLP, by first asking landowners to “volunteer” their property for mineral extraction.	This is how the process works. The Council must provide sufficient sites to meet the requirements set by the Region. Industry then submits potential sites that are assessed by this need and their suitability.
46	Glooston Parish Meeting	Preferred Options are identified.	
47	Blaby District Council	Preferred Options are identified.	
48	The Gypsy Council	Collecting various Council plans and will process national spread of policy on provision of caravan sites for Gypsy and Traveller families. Would like to know where the sections on provision of sites is placed with a map to indicate the approved land.	These comments would not appear to be directly relevant to the Minerals Development Framework.
49	British Waterways	After Use Issue 1 – Option E could still provide benefits in relation to Options A-D but would allow each scheme to be tailored to local circumstances. Concerned with the content of 2 nd sentence in paragraph 2.16. The following is an alternative suggestion: “The scope for transporting freight on waterways may be limited due to the size of the navigation and the navigation routes. However, where it is appropriate to move freight by water this option should not be disregarded”.	Noted. Sentence removed in rewrite.
50	Sport England – East	Blanket approach to the after use of sites may not	Para 11.14 has regard to recreation and leisure as a

	Midlands	work, as sites may be more suitable for one use than another. Restoration for leisure and recreation uses should be considered as part of an overall strategy, not just site by site.	possible after-use in some situations.
51	Woodland Trust	Preferred Options are identified. Woodland Trust welcomes the recognition of woodland as a key after use for mineral sites.	Noted.
52	Nottinghamshire County Council	No comments at this stage, but would welcome opportunity to comment on future stages of plan preparation.	Noted.
53	Government Office for the East Midlands	<p>Acknowledged that consultation on all three DPDs being undertaken together at this stage, but important that at subsequent stages, documentation for each DPD is separated out. This is necessary to indicate which options relate to which DPD.</p> <p>Reference to importance of considering Community Strategy in introductory chapter, but no further mention is made. Not clear whether there any matters that need to be addressed in the preparation of DPDs. There would be benefit in more explicit assessment of the environmental implications of the options.</p> <p>Generally this document is not likely to be very accessible to the general public. It would be helpful to reduce the space devoted to current policies and expand sections on key issues and options for policy development when further documents are prepared.</p> <p>Transportation pressures are recognised in 'background' chapter but no mention of different forms of transport within the issues and options chapter. Should be included.</p> <p>Documents ignore presence of NEMA as an inter-modal air to road freight facility, although it is recognised that air freight is not a realistic option for the transport of waste and minerals.</p> <p>Useful to provide info. On the extent of reserves and future demand for minerals in Chapter 2. It would also be helpful to assess the implications of national and</p>	<p>Two separate documents are being prepared from Preferred Options stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to make the Preferred Options documents more accessible.</p> <p>Different forms of transport recognised in para 9.15.</p> <p>Because it is not a realistic option it is felt it is not relevant to include as a method to transport minerals and waste.</p> <p>Chapter 7 provides information on reserves and predicted future requirements. Provision of minerals for Leicestershire is set by the Region.</p>

		<p>regional requirements and address issues such as implications of the growth proposals for Northamptonshire and the proposals for dealing with the spoil from mineral workings.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the assessments for the different minerals assume a continuation of previous levels of demand and if so whether this is realistic and/or desirable. It would be useful to expand upon the spatial implications of the options for each mineral. In paragraph 6.3 it would be desirable to identify potential sites so that all stakeholders have an opportunity to consider the potential sites that have been put forward in the past by site promoters.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 indicates predicted demand levels.</p> <p>Site Allocations documents indicate those sites put forward by industry and those considered suitable to meet local requirements.</p>
54	Nottingham East Midlands Airport	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p> <p>Would be grateful to be consulted at all stages. Essential that safe operation of aircraft is not compromised and due regard of the potential for bird strike taken account of.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy 35 has regard to this.</p>
55	East Midlands Development Agency	<p>No comment at this stage, but would be grateful to be informed of subsequent stages, in particular preparation of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
56	The Occupier, 12 Brosdale Drive	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p>	
57	Cllr Harrington, Lutterworth Town Council	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p>	
58	Midland Quarry Products	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p>	
59	Sutton Bonington Parish Council	<p>Registered their concerns with regard to the possibility of sand and gravel being extracted between Normanton on Soar and Hathern.</p> <p>Ask to be consulted on any developments on this site.</p>	<p>This area has not been put forward as a potential extraction site.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
60	A. J. Irwin	<p>Preferred Options are identified.</p> <p>Possible scarcity in local objections to mineral development does not indicate lack of interest. It is purely a function of complexity and individuals time to</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

		address details.	

Table 2

	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Option F
Sand and Gravel Issue 1	21	3	6	5		
Sand and Gravel Issue 2	3	13	16			
Igneous Rock Issue 1	7	9	10			
Limestone Issue 1	5	8	7			
Recycled Materials Issue 1	15	6	4	3		
Other Construction Minerals Issue 1	12	10	4			
Gypsum Issue 1	6	9	2			
Brick Clay Issue 1	8	10	3			
Fireclay Issue 1	11	6	7	11	3	2
Coal Issue 1	10	11	4			
Restoration Issue 1	11	10	13			
After-use Issue 1	11	11	6	7	6	
Site Management Issue 1	9	15	10			

The above table indicates the pattern of choices, where preferred options were identified in responses received. In some cases respondents did not identify an option for a particular issue, whilst others considered that some of the options were not alternatives and therefore selected more than one option for an issue.

According to the above results the conclusions of the consultation exercise for each issue are summarised as follows:

Sand and Gravel Issue 1. The most preferred option by a significant margin was for policies to release additional sand and gravel resources to meet National and Regional guidelines by the use of extensions to existing operations. This is the approach to be taken in the Preferred Options documents.

Sand and Gravel Issue 2. There was a fairly even split between the options of defining additional sand and gravel resources by the use of preferred areas and the identification of site allocations at the local level. Additional resources will be identified at a local level.

Igneous Rock Issue 1. There was little difference in numbers between the three options for policy controls. The option most chosen was to continue levels of extraction at present rates, having regard to National guidelines and reflecting current Structure Plan policy. This is the preferred option.

Limestone Issue 1. There was a fairly even split between the three options. The most preferred option was to balance the continued supply of major markets and the impacts that arise locally. Again, this is the preferred option taken by the planning authority.

Recycled Materials Issue 1. The clearly preferred option was for aggregate recycling facilities to be located at existing mineral sites, especially those that import construction and demolition wastes. There was little support for locating them on industrial estates close to the waste sources or of offering no locational advice. The preference will be to locate such facilities at existing mineral sites but should insufficient facilities be found to accommodate that set by the Region then consideration will be given to locating facilities on existing industrial estates where environmentally acceptable.

Other Construction Minerals Issue 1. There was a fairly even split between in providing a landbank for gypsum, brick clay and fireclay covering a 15-year period and a 25-year period. The brick clay annex to the draft MPS1 does not give guidance on the recommended period a landbank should cover but indicates that the MPA should aim to maintain a stock of permitted reserves reflecting the proposed period of operation of the works, which may be 20 year or more. A generic landbank covering the gypsum, brick clay and fireclay industries is not to be implemented, instead landbanks will be set for each individual industry.

Gypsum Issue 1. There was a fairly even split between focusing on the need to meet local and/or regional demands for plasters and balancing the continued supply of major markets and the impacts that arise locally. The preferred option is to focus on present levels and have regard to local landbanks.

Brick Clay Issue 1. The need to balance the continued supply of major markets and the impacts that arise locally and having a strategy that focuses on the need to meet local and/or regional demands were relatively evenly split. The preferred option is to focus on present levels and have regard to local landbanks.

Fireclay Issue 1. There was an exactly even split between more permanent stocking and blending facilities at works sites and ensuring that access to fireclays associated with opencast coal operations is achieved. There was little support for importing fireclays from elsewhere and making no provision. The MPA will take both options forward as their preferred options for fireclay.

Coal Issue 1. Very even split between identifying the extent of the shallow coalfield and highlighting potential areas of search for future extraction within it and establishing a forward programme of potential workable reserves. The Preferred Option document will identify the shallow coalfield.

Restoration Issue 1. Restricting backfilling with construction and demolition wastes and a preference for restoration designs at lower levels were identified as both being the two most favoured options for site restoration. It is unlikely that any one option would be sufficient to cover all possible restoration schemes, therefore, all options will be utilised in the Preferred Options policy.

After-use Issue 1. There was an even split between options to give a priority approach to after-use that seeks the promotion of biodiversity and woodland establishment. These will be utilised alongside the options to protect soil resources and to facilitate leisure and recreation after-uses. Each one will be used where appropriate to the local circumstances.

Site management Issue 1. A clear preference for the provision of flexible long-term management of sites was identified. This is the preferred option for site management; to agree a management term with the operator suitable to the locality.