

LEICESTERSHIRE MINERALS DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

CORE STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

PUBLIC EXAMINATION

Respondent: Quarry Products Association

Submission by: Ken Hobden
Director of Planning
Quarry Products Association

MINERALS – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Answers to questions in “Issues and Matters for Discussion”

1. No comment
2. No comment
3. Further explanatory text should be provided. As drafted DC1 implies that “other sustainability objectives” have been defined that may conflict with the Government’s objectives for sustainable minerals development. The other objectives should certainly be properly identified. At present, the only reference appears to be to Draft RSS Core Objectives.
4. No comment
5. Whilst opportunities for enhancement should be sought, there is no National planning policy backing for making enhancement of the character and quality of an area a requirement of planning permission being granted. It is also unreasonable to require all impacts to be minimised. Minimising impacts may involve developers in unnecessary cost and could have implications for other aspects of the development. Such policies should be based upon a requirement to ensure that all impacts are controlled to acceptable levels.

As drafted, DC2 is not effective as it is inflexible and therefore unsound.

6. No comment
7. NO. There is also potential for DC3 to conflict with National Policy as the test of need and benefits is not the same as the overriding national importance test set out in MPS1, Paragraph 14, (seventh bullet point).
8. See the response to question 7.
9. No comment.
10. No comment
11. No comment
12. No comment.
13. No comment
14. No comment
15. DC7 does not make it clear what is meant by “important archaeological remains.” The policy does not seem therefore to be deliverable or monitorable and is consequently unsound.

The accompanying text should make reference to “Mineral Extraction and Archaeology: A Practice Guide (English Heritage 2008)” which addresses these issues.

16. No comment
17. No comment
18. No comment
19. No comment
20. No comment
21. Please see the response to Question 5. In policies referring to transport impacts, reference should be made to controlling adverse impacts to acceptable levels.

22. As drafted, DC16 conflicts with Circular 1/2003 and is therefore unsound. The policy should be re-worded to reflect the important difference between “hazards” and “risks”.
23. No comment
24. No comment
25. NO. Risks associated with bird strike are managed by application of conditions related to matters that are already included in Box 4, notably; restoration, aftercare and after-use.
26. No comment