

**LEICESTERSHIRE
MINERALS DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**CORE STRATEGY &
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

**HEARING AGENDA
SUPPLY: GENERAL MATTERS AND AGGREGATES**

Whether the strategy for the supply of minerals is supported by the background facts

1. Does the DPD spell out what are the appropriate contributions towards local, regional and national needs (Para 4.5)?
2. Would it be better to define landbanks at the point where the term is first used (Para 4.6) rather than later in the text (Para 4.15)?
3. Are minerals of regional and national significance clearly identified (Para 4.10)? What is the status of the categorisation?
4. In Policy CS1, does the DPD provide clarity as to what would constitute “an adequate and steady supply of minerals”? Is there clarity as to how “need” would be demonstrated? Have anticipated needs been quantified for all minerals?

Whether there is clear evidence and guidance on how much extraction of aggregate minerals is intended to take place and how best to maintain an adequate and steady supply

5. What and where is the evidence base setting out information on permitted reserves (Para 4.19 and Box 1)?
6. In Para 4.19 and Box 1 (and elsewhere) does any adjustment need to be made for Rutland? Also, what are the figures from the emerging RSS?
7. How does the list of active sand and gravel sites (Para 4.20) compare with those listed in the footnote to Box 1?
8. Should policies governing the identification of reserve sites be included in the core strategy (Para 4.23 and Policy CS2)?
9. In respect of Para 4.26, what and where is the evidence base setting out information on permitted reserves and subsequent planning permissions?
10. In Box 2 (and Policy CS2), does any adjustment need to be made for Rutland? Also, what are the figures from the emerging RSS?
11. Have the figures in Box 2 been over-estimated? Will provision need to be made for future reserves at rail-linked sites? [Aggregate Industries]
12. In Box 2, should the total requirement be given as 344.5m tonnes (as in Policy CS2)?
13. In Policy CS2 (and in respect of other minerals), would it be better to set a target for new reserves sought over the plan period? [GOEM]

14. Should there be greater flexibility with regard to landbanks (Policy CS2)? Should the landbanks to be maintained extend beyond the end of the plan period? [Quarry Products Association; Lafarge]
15. In Policy CS2, should there be a preference for extensions at quarries served by rail? [GOEM]

Whether there is clear evidence and guidance on the locations where extraction of aggregate minerals may take place

16. In respect of the priority to be given to the extension of existing sites, should Croft Quarry be excluded / subject to additional protection? [BDC; Croft Parish Council; Huncote Parish Council]
17. In respect of the priority to be given to the extension of existing sites, should Bardon be excluded? [Residents of Brickhill Cottage; Woodhouse Parish Council]
18. Should Policy CS2 contain a presumption against the extraction of rock from new sites? [GOEM]

Whether there would be adequate safeguarding of resources

19. Policy CS10 (Resource management) supports the extraction of proven mineral reserves. Is this positive enough? Should developers be required to demonstrate that they have actively considered extraction?
20. Policy CS10 supports the use of high quality materials for appropriate purposes. Is this positive enough? Is it more a question of the MPA resisting the use of high quality materials for inappropriate purposes?
21. Should aggregate railheads be protected under Policy CS10 and Policy DC8? [Lafarge]

Anticipated participants:

MPA
Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
Quarry Products Association
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Croft Parish Council
Woodhouse Parish Council
Residents of Brickhill Cottage, Shaw Lane, Markfield
Huncote Parish Council