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E.0 Executive Summary

What is a Minerals Local Plan (MLP)?

E.1 A Local Plan is drawn up by local planning authorities in consultation with the community and is a plan for the future development of the local area. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) is the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) for all minerals planning within the administrative boundary of Gloucestershire and as such is required to produce a Minerals Local Plan (MLP).

E.2 Gloucestershire began work on a Minerals Core Strategy (MCS) in 2005 and undertook two consultation stages Issues and Options (2006) and Preferred Options (2008). However following the Preferred Options consultation work on the MCS was paused in order to focus on production of the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) for Gloucestershire.

E.3 The WCS was adopted in November 2012 and the priority is to now focus on the reactivation of the MCS as a Minerals Local Plan (MLP). This will provide both a review of the 2003 MLP and on adoption have an up-to-date set of policies consistent with Government policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

What is this consultation about?

E.4 This consultation is intended to draw together the outcomes of the earlier MCS consultation stages along with some new and up-to-date evidence in a format that enables further input from stakeholders prior to a draft of the plan being produced.

E.5 Where certain aspects of the plan have already been consulted upon (such as the Vision, Strategic Objectives and preferred policy options) some preferred policy approaches have been suggested.

E.6 However, some aspects of the plan are totally new (such as the inclusion of potential site allocations and minerals safeguarding) and these areas are presented to stakeholders as options. There is a lot of evidence underpinning this report and where the evidence should be read in conjunction with the report, it is signposted throughout the document.

Spatial Strategy

E.7 The spatial portrait sets out current position and eight drivers for change have been identified for the county which are factual pieces of evidence suggesting change is required. From the drivers for change, the proposed spatial vision has been developed which details our aspirations for the future-what an ideal picture for the county at 2030 would be in relation to minerals. From the vision seven strategic priorities have been identified which will be delivered through the policies of the plan.
E.8 The spatial strategy sets out how we are going to arrive at where we want to be at the end of the plan period (2030). Throughout the adopted plan the policies will be linked to the vision and priorities. It is therefore important at this stage that we ensure we have the right vision and priorities. It is also essential to ensure there are no areas of the vision and strategic priorities that are not delivered through policy. The table in Appendix A shows how each policy links to the strategic priorities.

Minerals Safeguarding

E.9 The NPPF indicates that MPAs should delineate Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs). The purpose of an MSA is to ensure that economic mineral resources are not unduly sterilised by incompatible development and where appropriate encourage the extraction of minerals prior to incompatible development taking place.

E.10 Options have been presented for safeguarding each of the main mineral resource blocks in the county (Limestone, Sandstone, Sand and Gravel, Clay and Coal) and it is possible that the final approach to mineral safeguarding could be either a single option or combination of the options selected. In addition, two policies for implementing safeguarding have been proposed.

Site Allocations

E.11 Each MPA is required to make provision for maintaining the landbanks in its area in accordance with the timescales outlined in the NPPF. In Gloucestershire this means that throughout the plan period there should be a rolling landbank of permitted reserves that is 10 years for crushed rock and 7 years for sand and gravel. The landbanks are based upon the 10 year average sales figures as detailed within the Local Aggregates Assessment.

E.12 In the county there are insufficient permitted reserves to maintain these landbanks taking into account issues such as maintaining productive capacity, therefore it has been indicated within the evidence base that new sites will need to be identified and allocated within the plan in order for the landbanks to be maintained.

E.13 Eight sites have been presented as options for potential allocations for crushed rock aggregates (four in the Forest of Dean and four in the Cotswolds) and ten sites for sand and gravel (eight in the Upper Thames Valley and two in the Severn Vale). These sites are presented with outline maps and an accompanying table containing summary information about the sites. It must be stressed that no decisions have been taken as yet as to which site options should be taken forward into the plan as preferred site allocations.
**Policies**

E.14 In total Thirty-four potentially NPPF compliant policies have been proposed to replace the fifty-two 2003 MLP policies and one policy is being consulted upon as to whether it should be replaced or included in the new MLP.

E.15 Some of these policies are called *Strategic Policy Aims* which are more higher level strategic policies which sometimes require the MPA to implement rather than being intended for development management purposes. The remaining majority of the policies are intended to be used for development management purposes and cover all of the policy issues covered in the 2003 MLP. There is also a table provided in Appendix B which details how the policies have been replaced.

**Consultation**

E.16 This document is the main consultation report. There is a separate questionnaire with questions relating to each section, policy, option, site or background evidence paper (including the accompanying *Sustainability Appraisal* and *Habitats Regulations Assessment* reports).

E.17 Whilst it is not essential for you to respond to every question, it is really helpful to us if you could specify which draft policy or options you are responding to. (There is also a general question where you can add any additional comments you may have which you may feel do not fit under any of the other questions).

**What happens next?**

E.18 All of the responses received to this consultation will be considered and reported upon. A draft of the MLP will then be produced prior to the formal publication stage. This will allow stakeholders a further chance to engage with the process and help us to shape the MLP. It is anticipated that the pre-publication draft consultation will be prepared for further consultation in early 2015.

**Anticipated MLP stages**

- Site Options and Draft Policy Framework Consultation - June-July 2014
- Pre-Publication Draft Consultation - Early 2015
- Formal Publication - Summer 2015
- Submission to Secretary of State - Autumn 2015
- Hearings (Examination) - Late 2015 / Early 2016
- Inspector’s Report and MLP Adoption - Mid 2016
Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Minerals

About Minerals

1.1.1 Minerals are vital to the nation’s economy and touch upon everyone’s life. They are essential for a diverse range of purposes including: construction, iron and steel smelting and manufacturing of products such as glass, plastics, cement, medicines, foods and cosmetics. This makes minerals necessary for most things we do in everyday life.

1.1.2 The move towards sustainable development requires us to reassess and manage the use of finite and environmentally sensitive natural resources such as minerals including the impact of their extraction on the environment. However, until sustainable sources of alternative materials, particularly for aggregates, can be identified and properly utilised, the continued careful planning of the extraction of primary minerals is essential.

Minerals in Gloucestershire

1.1.3 Gloucestershire has a diverse geological base to provide many of the minerals required for the county. Whilst there may be geologically more minerals available, only the following minerals are currently extracted in Gloucestershire:

- Sand and gravel for aggregates
- Limestone for aggregates, building, walling and roofing stone and other non-aggregates purposes including the production of agricultural lime and other industrial purposes
- Sandstone for building purposes
- Clays for brickmaking and engineering purposes
- Coal

The geology of Gloucestershire and the types of minerals economically produced in the county are discussed further in the Evidence Paper Mineral Safeguarding and the proposed policy framework and options for mineral safeguarding in Section 3 of this report.

1.2 Minerals planning

What is a Minerals Local Plan (MLP)?

1.2.1 A Local Plan is drawn up by local planning authorities in consultation with the community and is a plan for the future development of the local area. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) is the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) for all minerals planning within the administrative boundary of Gloucestershire and as such is required to produce a Minerals Local Plan (MLP).
Influences on the Minerals Local Plan

National Policy

1.2.2 All MPAs are required to produce a MLP under the Town and Country Planning Act (1990). This was amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) (and subsequently amended by the Planning Act 2008). The 2004 Act introduced the concept of producing ‘Core Strategies’ rather than ‘Local Plans’. A core strategy was designed to be a strategic level document with the key strategic policies and all detailed matters such as site allocations and development management policies to be dealt with in subsequent development plan documents. However, since the Localism Act (2011), local planning authorities are now encouraged to produce more composite ‘local plans’. If local planning authorities wish to produce separate detailed plans the reasons need to be clearly justified.

1.2.3 There is a specific set of regulations The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which outlines the process which a local authority must follow when producing a Local Plan.

1.2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) provides the policy framework for planning which all local plans must be consistent with. The NPPF provides all Government planning policy including for minerals. The only exception is for waste planning which is undergoing a separate consultation process. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (March 2014) provides further detail to support the NPPF.

Strategic Policy

1.2.5 Since the abolishment of regional spatial strategies and structure plans, the Government has introduced the requirement for local authorities to engage with neighbouring authorities, other authorities in two-tier areas such as Gloucestershire and other specified bodies such as the Environment Agency and Natural England on strategic issues. This is known as the Duty to Co-operate and is covered under section 110 of the Localism Act, which introduces an amendment to section 33A of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. It is a particularly important consideration for local plan-making because it covers legal, process and context of local plans and subsequently is the first issue which an Inspector will assess at the examination into the plan.

1.2.6 The Inspector will consider whether the local planning authority has fulfilled its duty under section 33A so as to maximise the effectiveness of the plan making process when planning for strategic cross boundary matters. If the Inspector is satisfied that the local planning authority has complied with the duty, the examination will proceed to consider whether the plan is sound.
1.2.7 An evidence paper about how the County Council has engaged with other authorities so far under *Duty to Co-operate* has been produced to accompany this consultation. However the County Council need to continually engage with relevant bodies throughout the plan-making process.

Local Policy

1.2.8 Gloucestershire adopted a Minerals Local Plan in 2003 which contained site allocations and a policy framework for minerals planning in Gloucestershire.

1.2.9 Following the introduction of the 2004 Act, statutory transitional arrangements were put into place for converting existing Local Plans (adopted under the previous Town and Country Planning Act 1990) into the new-style Plans. The documents were automatically saved for a period of at least three years from 2004. Beyond 2007 only some of the policies and proposals were saved for a longer period. This saving process has been undertaken and the directions were made by the Secretary of State.\(^1\) Subsequent to the introduction of the NPPF in March 2012, these ‘saved’ policies can be used for decision-making purposes as far as they are consistent with the policies of the NPPF.

1.2.10 Up until April 2013 there were regional spatial strategy and structure plan policies in place but these were revoked by the Secretary of State and therefore no longer have development plan status.

*What does this mean for Gloucestershire?*

1.2.11 Gloucestershire began work on a Minerals Core Strategy (MCS) in 2005 and undertook two consultation stages Issues and Options (2006) and Preferred Options (2008). However following the Preferred Options consultation work on the MCS was paused in order to focus on production of the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) for Gloucestershire.

1.2.12 The WCS was adopted in November 2012 and the priority is to now focus on the reactivation of the MCS as a Minerals Local Plan (MLP). This will provide both a review of the 2003 MLP and on adoption have an up-to-date set of policies consistent with Government policies within the NPPF.

1.2.13 The earlier consultation stages focused on issues such as the spatial vision, spatial objectives, core policies and strategy for minerals development in the county over the 15 years following adoption. Following the changes introduced by the NPPF and the Localism Act 2012 (outlined above), the MLP will now incorporate the MCS and the other documents which Gloucestershire had intended to produce subsequent to the MCS as well as setting out an implementation

framework for achieving delivery of the vision, and subsequent monitoring systems.

Documents from the Issues and Options consultation stage can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107650/1-MCS-Issues--Options---COMPLETE

The documents include:
- MCS Issues and Options Part A Summary Version for Public Consultation
- MCS Issues and Options Part A Explanatory Paper
- MCS Issues and Options SA Report
- HRA Screening Report for MCS Issues and Options
- MCS Issues and Options Consultation Response Report
- MCS Issues and Options Full Consultation Representations
- SA Minerals Response Report

The main consultation documents from the Preferred Options consultation stage can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107661/2-MCS-Preferred-Options---COMPLETE

These documents include:
- Minerals Preferred Options consultation document
- MCS Preferred Options SA Report
- MCS Preferred Options SA Non Technical Report
- HRA Screening for MCS Preferred Options
- MCS Preferred Options consultation response report

A raft of evidence papers were produced to support the preferred options consultation stage. These can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107668/Evidence-Base-for-the-MLP

These documents include:
- MCS A Sand Gravel Provision and Strategic Locations Report
- MCS B Crushed Rock Provision and Strategic Locations Report
- MCS C Natural Building Roofing Stone Report
- MCS D Secondary Recycled Aggregates Report
- MCS E Spatial Portrait, Vision, Strategic Objectives
- MCS F After Minerals - Restoration Aftercare Afteruse
- MCS G Mineral Resources and Safeguarding
- MCS H Mineral Working in the Green Belt
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 1 Transport
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 2 Links with Districts and Neighbouring Authorities
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 3 Flooding & Hydrological Issues
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 4 Landscape & AONB
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS - MCS - 5 Biodiversity
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 6 Archaeology and the Historic Environment
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 7 Implementation & Monitoring
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 8 Glossary
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 9 Proposals Map
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 10 Climate Change

1.2.14 The MLP will set out the framework for addressing the county’s appropriate contribution to the national need for a steady and adequate supply of minerals whilst balancing social, economic and environmental issues. It will deal with making provision for sand and gravel (S&G) and crushed rock (C/R) and other key spatial matters relating to minerals,
such as the strategic locational issues and strategic minerals site allocations.

References and links for all of the national and local policies and documents discussed in this section can be found in the appendices.

1.3 **This consultation**

*What is this consultation about?*

1.3.1 This consultation is intended to draw together the outcomes of the earlier MCS consultation stages along with some new and up-to-date evidence in a format that enables further input from stakeholders prior to a draft of the plan being produced.

1.3.2 Where certain aspects of the plan have already been consulted upon (such as the Vision, Strategic Objectives and preferred policy options) some preferred policy approaches have been suggested.

1.3.3 However, some aspects of the plan are totally new (such as the inclusion of sites and minerals safeguarding) and these areas are presented to stakeholders as options. **It must be stressed that no decisions have been taken as yet as to which site options should be taken forward into the plan as preferred site allocations.** Your responses will be important considerations for us when we produce the draft plan.

1.3.4 There is a lot of evidence underpinning this report and where there is additional information contained within an evidence paper that is of particular relevance to the section in question, the evidence paper will be clearly highlighted in a box (as shown below). A full list of links and documents referenced throughout the report will also listed in Appendix C and a glossary and list of abbreviations are listed in Appendix D.

1.3.5 This document has undergone a sustainability appraisal and the results have been fed into the accompanying SA report.

*How to respond*

1.3.6 This document is the main consultation report. There is a separate questionnaire with questions relating to each section, policy, option, site or background evidence paper.

1.3.7 Whilst it is not essential for you to respond to every question, it is really helpful to us if you could specify which question you are responding to. (There is also a general question where you can add any additional comments you may have which you may feel do not fit under any of the other questions).
1.3.8 The easiest way to respond to the consultation is via the following weblink https://gloucestershire-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/mlp_site_options/mlp_options_draft_policy . Please note if you are not using the web-based questionnaire to respond, please remember to include your name and contact details and to also state which questions you are responding to.

1.3.9 The consultation runs from Monday 23rd June 2014 and will close Monday 18th August at 5pm. Any responses received after the closing date will be recorded but there is no guarantee that they will be considered.

1.3.10 Further information on this consultation can be found on our website at http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/MLP-site-policy-options , but if you have any questions relating to the consultation and wish to speak to a team member please email m-wplans@gloucestershire.gov.uk or telephone 01452 425667.

Strategic Infrastructure – Minerals & Waste Policy
Block 5, Shire Hall
Gloucester
GL1 2TH

What happens next?

1.3.11 All of the responses received to this consultation will be considered and reported upon. A draft of the MLP will then be produced prior to the formal publication stage. This will allow stakeholders a further chance to engage with the process and help us to shape the MLP. It is anticipated that the pre-publication draft consultation will be prepared for further consultation in early 2015.
Section 2: The Spatial Strategy

2.1 The Spatial Portrait

2.1.1 The spatial portrait is an illustration of where Gloucestershire is at this moment in time. It is very much a factual description of Gloucestershire including administrative make-up, geographical location, infrastructure, geology, assets and constraints. It also outlines some of the key issues facing the county at the present moment in time in relation to future mineral requirements.

2.1.2 Technical Evidence Paper *MCS E Spatial Portrait, Vision, Strategic Objectives*² to the 2008 Preferred Options consultation outlined the spatial portrait for Gloucestershire and listed eight ‘drivers for change’. These are factual pieces of evidence which suggest change is required and there were no issues raised with them in the preferred options consultation. They have been updated here where relevant and there is now an opportunity to comment on whether they require further amendment and whether there are any other key drivers associated with mineral working in the county. Further to this consultation the drivers will be updated as necessary and included within the pre-publication draft of the MLP.

Drivers for change

- Construction aggregates are essential for delivering growth in the future. The contribution made from remaining local resources will need to take account of their environmental capacity for working.

- There are limited permitted reserves of construction aggregates in the county. As of 31/12/2012, and based on forecast levels of supply, there are sufficient amounts of workable crushed rock to last 18.58 years. For sand & gravel the remaining equate to 7.25 years.

- Growth is focused on the urban areas of Gloucester and Cheltenham and will include regeneration of brown-field land. This offers opportunities for the reuse and recycling of waste materials as a replacement for construction aggregates.

- Moving minerals by road puts a strain on an already pressurised highway network. It can cause adverse local impacts and contribute to climate change. However, highways need minerals for maintenance and improvement to meet future growth and to ease congestion.

• Sustainable minerals transport is limited in Gloucestershire due to the location of mineral resources. However, existing rail and water facilities are under capacity and in theory have potential for expansion. However the interest in securing investment for such infrastructure could be difficult. Importing minerals from beyond the county may also support sustainable transport, although investment is needed before this can become a reality.

• Gloucestershire is a rural ‘shire’ county with a number of international, national and regionally important environmental designations. These may constrain and sterilise mineral resources. However, working within designations can also bring environmental gains in some circumstances. A balance is therefore needed between the need for minerals and safeguarding environmental assets.

• Ever changing and competing interests for land may result in sterilisation of Gloucestershire’s mineral resources. A current area of concern is the Upper Thames Valley, where sand & gravel working competes with emerging nature conservation, tourism, recreation and military land-uses.

• The county has rich historic resources of invaluable cultural significance and tourism potential, which need safeguarding. However, this requires a supply of specialist building materials such as building stone. A clear strategy for protecting and recording the historic past is also needed.

2.2  The Spatial Vision

What is the role of the spatial vision?

2.2.1 A spatial vision is a view of the future based on overcoming key social, economic and environmental challenges. For mineral plans this means that the spatial vision must be focused on mineral priorities and the future management of these matters across the county. Spatial Visions became a requirement of all core strategies under the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act as translated into the national policy at the time (PPS12).

2.2.2 Whilst the NPPF is less prescriptive than earlier policy guidance as to the content of local plans, paragraph 17 of the NPPF does point to succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. This is discussed in the context of the 12 core planning principles which should underpin plan-making and decision-making. The NPPF (paragraph 21) also states that in drawing up local plans, local planning authorities should set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth. It is therefore proposed that the MLP will still contain a spatial vision that embraces these aims.
Earlier consultations on the vision

2.2.3 An early draft of a spatial vision for Gloucestershire was consulted upon through the Issues and Options consultation in 2006 including being a topic for discussion at stakeholder forum events. Comments raised through this process led to the revised spatial vision which was presented in the 2008 Preferred Options consultation.

Our preferred Vision

2.2.4 A further revised vision has been outlined below. Amendments have been made to the vision consulted upon in 2008, both in the light of the consultation responses made then and also to ensure that the vision is up-to-date and NPPF compliant.

2.2.5 Some of the changes include the addition of a specific reference to minimising the risk of birdstrike, changing the date to 2030 and the removal of references to regional planning. However, several consultees felt that the previous vision was too lengthy and wordy so the version presented here is shorter and more succinct than the previous version (in accordance with the NPPF). The detailed aspects of how the vision will be implemented will be considered through the policy framework contained in the MLP.

Proposed Spatial Vision

By 2030 Gloucestershire will be a clean, green, healthy and safe place in which to live, work and visit. It will be a leading county in managing its mineral resources and a successful contributor towards the achievements of sustainable development, sustainable communities, and reducing the impacts of climate change.

Local mineral resources will be integral to delivering renewal, regeneration and growth in the county. Specialist minerals will also have an important role in revitalising and restoring Gloucestershire’s historic and quality built environments, taking account of the different roles and character of different areas.

Greater emphasis will be placed upon maximising the reuse of materials and recycling of construction & demolition wastes as well as reducing in-site waste and promoting the optimum and most appropriate use of minerals. However, primary minerals will remain an essential part of the county’s mineral supply, particularly in terms of meeting local need. Provision for minerals will be made taking account of Gloucestershire’s environmental capacity.

Although road haulage is likely to remain the dominant form of transport, smarter supply chains will be sought. These include stricter haulage routes and more efficient practices. Through this approach vehicle movements for
minerals will be reduced on local roads leading to a reduction in vehicle emissions. This will also help curb local traffic growth, wear and tear on the road network, and reduce other adverse impacts such as noise, dust and road safety.

Where mineral working takes place, amenity, health, quality of life and economic vitality will be paramount to the decision making process. Mineral working will act as a positive driver for protecting and enhancing the quality of environmental assets and designations such as the Cotswolds and Wye Valley AONBs and will also assist in expanding the knowledge of our archaeological past. Through the process of mineral restoration, worked out mineral sites will be seen as a key resource for increasing biodiversity and geodiversity whilst at the same time minimising risk of birdstrike. In particular the successful co-ordination of mineral management in the Upper Thames Valley (including the adjacent areas of Wiltshire and Swindon) will be crucial to successful regeneration and restoration of the landscape in this area.

Further information relating to the process behind the spatial vision can be found in the documents from the earlier consultation stages (as detailed on page 8).

2.3 Strategic Objectives/Priorities

*What are strategic objectives/priorities?*

2.3.1 Strategic objectives explain how the spatial vision will be delivered. Their purpose is to provide the broad direction for the spatial strategy and guide the policy framework for the MLP.

2.3.2 The idea of strategic objectives emerged through the *2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act* and were incorporated into national policy through the former PPS1. The NPPF has now replaced PPS1 and paragraph 156 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities must *set out strategic priorities for the area in the local plan*. It also promotes the objective of sustainable development and how they should *seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development* (NPPF paragraphs 151-152).

*Earlier consultations on strategic objectives*

2.3.3 An early draft of strategic objectives for Gloucestershire was consulted upon through the Issues and Options consultation in 2006 including at stakeholder forum events. Comments raised through this process lead to the revised strategic objectives presented in the 2008 Preferred Options consultation.
Our preferred strategic priorities

2.3.4 In order to be compliant with the NPPF, it is proposed that we now refer to the strategic objectives as strategic priorities. The objectives that were presented in the 2008 consultation have been further revised to take account of national policy changes and also the comments received in response to that consultation.

Changes reflective of comments include:
- a slight reordering of objectives,
- inclusion of a reference to sustainable transport in relation to reuse and recycling,
- rewording of the Environment strategic objective to be appropriate to all landscapes and to include a reference to the historic environment.
- The reclamation objective has been expanded to include references to specific criteria outlined within paragraph 143 of the NPPF, to make reference to enhanced environmental standards and to include a reference to minimising risk of birdstrike hazard. Removal of reference to “worked-out” minerals sites.
- The transport objective has been expanded to taken account of the transport impacts of restoration proposals, to make reference to avoiding the use of roads unsuitable for HGVs and highlight the potential need to mitigation to the strategic road network.
- Resource management – deletion of the word practicable.
- People – word minimise has been replaced with mitigate against.

Proposed Strategic Priorities

Strategic Priority 1: Reuse & Recycling
To promote the maximum reuse and recycling of materials in preference to the use of primary minerals (where specification will allow), particularly where transportation is sustainable or kept to a minimum and the handling and processing of recyclates will not have an adverse impact on the environment or prejudice site restoration.

Strategic Priority 2: Provision & Supply
To ensure that appropriate provision is made for the supply of minerals to meet national, and local requirements including the aggregates provision identified within the local aggregates assessment. Full account must be given to – local environmental capacity; availability of workable and viable resources; and market conditions.

Strategic Priority 3: The Environment
To protect, and where appropriate, enhance, the quality of landscapes, habitats, heritage and other environmental assets, having full regard to their international, national or local importance.

Strategic Priority 4: People
To secure sound and enforceable working practices, which will mitigate against
adverse impacts on local communities and businesses and will be systematically monitored.

**Strategic Priority 5: Reclamation**
To secure both enhanced environmental standards and the highest possible standards and quality of mineral restoration and aftercare for mineral sites at the earliest opportunity, taking a spatial view of after use opportunities for – biodiversity, geodiversity, agriculture (including safeguarding of best and most versatile agricultural land and safeguarding soil resources), native woodland, public access, regeneration, the historic environment, recreation, contributing towards reducing climate change impacts (including the impact of traffic) and ensuring aerodrome safeguarding, with particular regard to preventing an increase in birdstrike hazard to air traffic.

**Strategic Priority 6: Resource Management**
To manage the county’s remaining mineral resources in a co-ordinated and efficient manner so as to ensure that future development will not result in mineral sterilisation; that where minerals are worked, they are put to their most optimal use; and that the amount of waste produced is minimised.

**Strategic Priority 7: Transport**
To reduce the impacts of hauling minerals by road and encourage more sustainable forms of transport, including necessary improvements to infrastructure. Where transportation by road is the only practicable option, roads unsuitable for HGVs will be avoided. Improvements to the existing strategic road network may be required to facilitate the transportation of minerals by HGV.

Further information about the process behind the strategic policies can be found in the documents relating to the earlier consultation stages as detailed on page 8.

### 2.4 Key Diagram and Proposals Map

2.4.1 Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that local plans should *indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map.*

**Key Diagram**

2.4.2 A very broad key diagram was consulted upon in the 2008 preferred options consultation. Some stakeholders made representations to this diagram and the principle of the MCS key diagram was generally supported by respondents. It was seen as a positive and clear approach for getting the message across to the reader. However, a number of comments pointed out possible changes to the diagram. These advised on the alignment of the navigable sections of the canal network and the landscape status of the Forest of the Dean area.
2.4.3 In addition, some respondents sought to discuss the accompanying supply opportunities text, for the MCS key diagram. In particular amendments were suggested to the importation arrangements for sand & gravel; exportation arrangements for crushed rock; and the inclusion of an internal supply option for secondary and recycled materials.

2.4.4 The comments have been considered and also taking account of the NPPF, a revised draft of the key diagram has been produced as shown on the previous stages. However, this is still not intended to be a definitive diagram as further alterations may be required following the outcome of this consultation, particularly in regards to mineral safeguarding.

*Proposals/Adopted Policies Map*

2.4.5 Following adoption of the Waste Core Strategy in November 2011, the County Council’s Proposals Map (also known as an *Adopted Policies map*) was amended to add the five sites allocated within the plan.

2.4.6 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 state in relation to the form and content of the adopted policies map that:

*The adopted policies map must be comprised of, or contain, a map of the local planning authority’s area which must—*

- be reproduced from, or be based on, an Ordnance Survey map;
- include an explanation of any symbol or notation which it uses; and
- illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan.

*Where the adopted policies map consists of text and maps, the text prevails if the map and text conflict.*

2.4.7 Whilst a number of major constraints are able to be illustrated in a printed document, the volume of information that is required on proposals maps in relation to constraints is substantial and difficult to present in one hard copy format. Therefore, the actual Gloucestershire Minerals and Waste Proposals Map is available in an interactive format at [http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/proposalsmap](http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/proposalsmap)

2.4.8 As the 2003 adopted Minerals Local Plan site allocations were formally saved by the Secretary of State under a saving direction⁴, these still form part of the adopted proposals map for the time being.

---

³The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 refers to the map as the “policies” map, whereas the NPPF refers to it as a “proposals” map.

⁴Available to view at [http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/CHandler.ashx?id=22187&p=0](http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/CHandler.ashx?id=22187&p=0)
2.5  **The Spatial Strategy**

2.5.1  As highlighted above, the spatial portrait sets out current position and our aspirations for the future are indicated in the vision and the strategic priorities (discussed below). The spatial strategy sets out how we are going to arrive at where we want to be at the end of the plan period (2030). Throughout the adopted plan the policies will be linked to the vision and priorities. It is therefore important at this stage that we ensure we have the right vision and priorities. It is also essential to ensure there are no areas of the vision and strategic priorities that are not delivered through policy. The remainder of this document will outline all the policies proposed to deliver the vision and objectives through the plan.

2.5.2  Throughout the evidence base a few strategic policy aims have been identified. These are slightly different to the strategic priorities in that they are intended to be higher level strategic policies and are not necessarily relevant for development management purposes because the delivery of these policies falls to the responsibility of the MPA, or the MPA working in partnership with other bodies and the mechanism for delivery through the plan and its development management policies.

2.5.3  The strategic policy aims which have been identified are outlined within this document in the relevant chapters prior to the development management policies.

2.6  **Climate change and Sustainable Development**

2.6.1  Certain climate change impacts could have a particularly devastating effect on Gloucestershire, such as increased risk of flooding (prevention of flood risk is covered in more detail in section 6.7 of this report). One of the ways to help prevent climate change is through the principle of sustainable development. The government has made a presumption in favour of sustainable development a key policy concept through the introduction of the NPPF and the Planning Inspectorate has drafted a model policy on presumption in favour of sustainable development which is recommended for inclusion in all local plans. This policy was included in the WCS as Core Policy WCS1 and it is proposed that it will also be included within the MLP in the form drafted overleaf.
Proposed Policy on Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Planning applications that accord with the policies in the MLP (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.
Section 3: Mineral Safeguarding

3.1 What is mineral safeguarding?

3.1.1 Para 142 of the NPPF states that
"Minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation."

3.1.2 Although mineral resources can be worked only where they occur this does not mean that every resource will be economical to work as this will depend on a host of factors such as the demand for the mineral and the costs of extraction and transport to market. Accordingly a particular mineral resource may not be favoured for extraction today but may become so at some time in the future. Consequently, where proven and viable mineral resources are identified, a sound policy framework is needed to ensure these resources are not lost to competing and / or incompatible development. If applicants for non mineral development are not aware of the presence of a mineral resource below the site when applications are made then the opportunity to extract some or all of the mineral before development takes place may be missed.

How mineral resources be safeguarded?

3.1.3 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should "define Minerals Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Minerals Consultation Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas"

3.1.4 Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) are areas of known economic mineral resource or conservation value that are identified and defined in a development plan. The purpose of a MSA is not to automatically preclude other forms of non-mineral development such as housing, but to ensure that mineral resources are adequately and effectively considered in all land-use planning decisions. MSAs are generally based on a known mineral resource area and may be further refined following discussions with the industry and other stakeholders. The process of safeguarding mineral resources does not mean that extraction will be automatically allowed or that non mineral development cannot take place. These decisions will be taken at the appropriate time and it should be noted that not all mineral resources or supporting infrastructure will merit safeguarding.
3.1.5 **Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs)** are intended for 'two-tier' local authority areas, such as in Gloucestershire, where some planning decisions are made by the County Council (*minerals and waste*) and most other planning decisions (such as housing and employment) are made by the District Councils. To be fully effective the safeguarding of mineral resources can therefore be achieved only through co-operation between the county and district planning authorities. MCAs provide the mechanism through which this can be achieved.

3.1.6 For example, when a District Council receives a planning application for new development within an area defined as a MCA, it should consult the County Council where the proposal would be likely to affect the winning and working of the mineral. Conversely, where the County Council receives a planning application for mineral development that may impact on another existing or proposed land use, such as housing, it should consult the relevant District Council.

3.1.7 In terms of the extent of the MCA, all parts of, or marginally more than a MSA can be defined as a Minerals Consultation Area but MPAs should seek advice from the minerals industries operating in their areas when they are considering the delineation of MCAs. As with MSAs, there is no presumption that resources in MCAs will actually be worked.

3.1.8 MSAs and MCAs should be identified on any development plan Proposals Map. This will include Proposals Maps produced by District Councils as part of their Development Plan Framework as well as Proposals Maps accompanying Minerals Local Plans.

3.1.9 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF also discusses other safeguarding requirements for mineral planning authorities to consider including the safeguarding of certain essential minerals infrastructure and the creation of appropriate policies to encourage prior extraction and environmental protection.

3.2 **Mineral safeguarding options**

3.2.1 The responses to the Preferred Options consultation in 2008 indicated that option MPO13 was the preferred approach to take forward. However this was a framework for a policy approach which now needs to be developed into policy options.

3.2.2 There are five mineral resources proposed to be safeguarded:

- **Carboniferous and Jurassic limestones**
- **Devonian and Carboniferous sandstones**
- **Unconsolidated and consolidated sand and gravel**
- **Carboniferous and Jurassic clays**
- **Coal**
An evidence paper on *Mineral Safeguarding* has been produced and undergone some early targeted consultation with key stakeholders for this issue such as the District Councils in Gloucestershire and mineral operators. The evidence paper incorporates the outcomes of this targeted engagement and outlines the approach taken to safeguarding the various minerals in Gloucestershire and how the options listed below have been reached.

For information on earlier consultation stages please refer to the documents detailed in page 8:

3.2.3 The various options are presented for each resource block. Stakeholders’ views on the mineral safeguarding options presented are sought with a view that a preferred approach to the delineation of each resource can be determined for the pre-publication draft of the MLP. Please note it is not intended for only one option to be selected, in some instances it is possible that the preferred option could include a combination of more than one of the options subject to consideration of the feedback we receive.
Options for Safeguarding the Limestone Resource

**Option 1**  Safeguard the entire limestone resource areas.

**Option 2**  Safeguard the main individual limestone formations which have historically been worked.

**Option 3**  Safeguard a buffer zone around existing quarries, other strategic limestone resource areas and any former quarries considered to be of importance for the preservation of historic buildings and monuments that are referred to the MPA. (500m buffer zone for sites where blasting would be involved in extraction and 250m at other sites).

**Option 4**  Safeguard a buffer zone of up to 1km around existing quarries, other strategically important limestone resource areas and any former quarries considered to be of importance for the preservation of historic buildings and monuments that are referred to the MPA.
Options for Safeguarding the Sandstone Resource

Option 1  Safeguard all Devonian sandstone resources *

Option 2  Safeguard all Pennant sandstone resources *

Option 3  Safeguard a 250m buffer zone around existing Devonian and Pennant sandstone quarries and any former quarries considered to be of importance for the preservation of historic buildings and monuments.

Option 4  Safeguard a buffer zone of up to 1km around existing quarries, other strategically important limestone resource areas and any former quarries considered to be of importance for the preservation of historic buildings and monuments that are referred to the MPA.

* The map shows a resource area that includes the bulk of the Devonian and Pennant sandstones but also some other sandstone formations
Options for Safeguarding the Sand and Gravel Resource

**Option 1** Safeguard all river terrace and known sub alluvial sand & gravel deposits countywide.

**Option 2** Safeguard only the river terrace deposits county wide

**Option 3** Safeguard only sand & gravel deposits in the Upper Thames Valley

**Option 4** Safeguard all of the Triassic and Permian sandstone formations in the northeast of the county.

**Option 5** Safeguard a 250m buffer zone around the existing quarries and other sand and gravel resource areas considered to be of potential importance for the future supply of aggregates.
Options for Safeguarding the Clay Resource

**Option 1** Safeguard clays in the Forest of Dean (linked to the Coalfield MSA).

**Option 2** Safeguard a 250m buffer for the Lias clay resources in the north east of the County around the existing brickworks.

**Option 3** Safeguard other existing clay extraction sites and resource areas identified by stakeholders.

**Option 4** Safeguard a buffer zone of up to 1km around existing quarries, other strategically important limestone resource areas and any former quarries considered to be of importance for the preservation of historic buildings and monuments that are referred to the MPA.
Options for Safeguarding the Coal Resource

Option 1 Safeguard the area shown on the Coal Authority safeguarding map i.e. the entire Forest of Dean coalfield.

Option 2 Safeguard the coalfield area as shown on the BGS Mineral Resource Map for Gloucestershire.

Option 3 Safeguard the Newent Coalfield as shown on the Coal Authority safeguarding map.

Other resources (Igneous Rock; Iron ore and Ochre; Hydrocarbons)
It is not proposed to delineate any formal MSAs for these minerals
3.2.4 Once the minerals safeguarding areas are defined the proposed policy framework approach is required to ensure that the areas are actually safeguarded. Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) are likely to be based on the final adopted MSAs. The proposed policy for MSAs is outlined below:

### Proposed Policy for Minerals Safeguarding Areas

Mineral Safeguarding Areas are defined in the accompanying Proposals Map for the sand and gravel, limestone, sandstone, coal and brick clay resources in Gloucestershire that are considered to be of current or future economic importance. These areas of mineral resources will be protected from unnecessary sterilisation by other development. Unless the applicant makes provision for the prior extraction of the mineral, planning permission for other development that would result in the direct or indirect sterilisation of the identified mineral resources in the defined MSAs will not be permitted unless:

- the applicant for planning permission can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the MPA by way of a minerals assessment (MA) that the mineral that would otherwise be sterilised is not of economic value therefore neither feasible nor practicable to work; or
- the mineral can be extracted to the satisfaction of the MPA without unacceptable community or environmental impacts prior to the incompatible development taking place; or
- the incompatible development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site left in a condition that does not inhibit later mineral extraction or mineral extraction elsewhere within the MSA; or
- there is an overriding need for the incompatible development that outweighs the need for the mineral; or
- the development constitutes ‘exempt development’, namely the following development:
  - household development within the curtilage of a residential property
  - the alteration or extension to existing buildings or for a change of use of an existing building whose use would not be incompatible with mineral extraction
  - minor developments such as walls, fences and works to trees
  - advertisements
  - reserved matter development unless the MPA required to be consulted at this determination stage
  - Listed Building consent
  - Certificates of lawfulness

3.2.5 There are thousands of applications dealt with each year by the District Councils in Gloucestershire and it would not be practical or relevant to consider mineral safeguarding for every type of non-mineral...
development. A significant proportion of the applications are either too minor or of a nature that would not actually sterilise the minerals. Therefore to remove unnecessary bureaucracy some standing advice will be provided so that the District Councils do not need to consult the County Council on such applications. The proposed standing advice is listed below:

**Proposed Standing Advice for implementation of the Policy for Mineral Safeguarding Areas**

District Councils should consult the County Council on any planning application they receive for non minerals development which falls within the boundary of a MSA or within a safeguarding zone of an ancillary minerals facility other than applications for:
- householder development within the curtilage of a residential property
- the alteration or extension to existing buildings or for a change of use of an existing building whose use would not be incompatible with mineral extraction
- minor developments such as walls, fences and works to trees
- advertisements
- reserved matter development unless the MPA required consultation at the outline stage
- Listed Buildings consent
- Certificates of Lawfulness

3.2.6 As well as safeguarding mineral resource areas from sterilisation, mineral infrastructure also need to be safeguarded. This is outlined in Paragraph 143 of the NPPF:
- existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, including recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials; and
- existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material.

3.2.7 To ensure that the MLP is fully compliant with the NPPF, a second minerals safeguarding policy has been proposed for minerals infrastructure and is outlined overleaf:
Proposed Safeguarding Policy for Minerals Infrastructure

Sites for bulk transportation of minerals and ancillary processing sites for aggregates that are shown on the Proposals Map will be safeguarded from incompatible development that could adversely affect their operation by a safeguarding zone around the site. Planning permission for such development within the safeguarding zone will not be granted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be no incompatibility between the two uses or that adequate controls can be implemented to ensure this to be the case.

3.2.8 The following table is from the Mineral Safeguarding Paper (Table 2) and details the infrastructure and facilities in Gloucestershire proposed to be safeguarded through the Safeguarding Policy for Minerals Infrastructure. It should be noted that the “existing” and “planned” columns in this table may not be complete. The MPA envisage that the Table to support the policy can be updated and completed for the draft MLP.

Table 1: Infrastructure and facilities proposed to be safeguarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility for bulk transport of minerals</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Planned by the Councils</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Head</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spurs from the main line exist at Ashchurch and Sharpness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail link to quarry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some quarries in the FoD were historically rail linked but further rail links within the MLP period seem unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfage with storage/handling/processing facilities</td>
<td>1.Sharpness Docks Discuss with SDC/BWB 2.Nettlebridge Gloucester on Gloucester Sharpness Canal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>See existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site for value added and alternative aggregate facilities</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Planned by the Councils</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete batching plant site</td>
<td>Huntsmans Quarry, Naunton Chelmix, Gloucester MC Cullimore, Netherhills Coln Quarry Hanson, Cheltenham Hope, Cheltenham Hope, Gloucester Kellaway Building Supplies, Stonehouse</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Other than listed sites most likely to be sited at quarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coated stone plant site</td>
<td>Stowfield Quarry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete products plant site</td>
<td>Huntsmans Quarry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites for handling/processing and distribution of alternative aggregates</td>
<td>Smiths Moreton Valence MC Cullimore, Netherhills Allstones, Gloucester Budget Skips, Honeybourne Complete Utilities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Construction Aggregates

4.1 Overview of Construction Aggregates in Gloucestershire

4.1.1 There are two types of minerals economically extracted as aggregates for construction purposes in Gloucestershire. These are limestone (which is crushed) and sand and gravel.

4.1.2 Every year the amount of aggregate minerals remaining in quarries with valid planning permissions (including sites which are not currently operating) are added together to calculate the ‘landbank’. For many years there has been a requirement to maintain landbanks for certain minerals. The requirements to maintain a landbank for aggregates has been reaffirmed by the NPPF. These are:

- 10 years for Crushed Rock
- 7 years for Sand & Gravel

4.1.3 There are three crushed rock sites in the county whose reserves are not included within the annually calculated landbank because they have a legal classification of “dormant” under the Environment Act 1995. This means that no minerals development may lawfully be carried out at these sites until a new scheme of conditions has been submitted to, and approved by, the MPA. Reserves present in these sites would only ever be considered within the landbank at a point in time when they could be legally worked under a new scheme of conditions. It should be stressed...
that these do not represent a significant quantity of reserves in any event.

4.1.4 Since the introduction of the NPPF the requirement to maintain aggregate mineral landbanks is now based on average sales figures over 10 years. The 10-year average figure for Gloucestershire has been explored in more detail within the second Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) which has identified the 10-year average sales figures for Gloucestershire as follows:
- 1.6mtpa for Crushed Rock
- 0.83mtpa for Sand & Gravel

4.1.5 The following table is taken from the second LAA and shows how the 10 year average has been calculated for the landbanks in Gloucestershire:

Table 2: Gloucestershire Crushed Rock C/R and Sand and Gravel Production 2003-2012(mt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>10 Yr Av</th>
<th>3 Yr Av</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/R</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.6 This means that for any given year of the plan period there should be sufficient permitted reserves within the landbank to maintain extraction at the average rate for the minimum number of years outlined in the NPPF. For Gloucestershire that equates to:
- Crushed Rock 1.6mt x 10 years = 16mt
- Sand & Gravel 0.83mt x 7 years = 5.81mt

4.1.7 Should the reserves within a landbank fall below these figures then it is known as a shortfall and the NPPF identifies that this is an indicator that a plan should be reviewed and that more reserves will need to be permitted.

4.1.8 The NPPF also identifies other factors which need to be taken into account. For example there may also be instances when the landbank may theoretically contain enough reserves, but there is still a requirement for more reserves to be permitted. An example of this is when there is insufficient productive capacity to meet the potential annual figure. The most likely scenario of this is as quarry units become exhausted and close, either replacement reserves are required to maintain the required provision or other quarries may need to increase production. If either cannot occur a shortfall in productive capacity can occur.

---

5 Prior to the NPPF figures were based upon national and regional guidelines for aggregate production. This is discussed in Section 1 of the Minerals Technical Evidence Paper.
6 Based on 2003-2012 sales figures.
7 SWAWP Annual Reports
4.1.9 The landbank figures in the NPPF are minimum requirements and often the landbank will need to take account of longer periods of time. Quarries generally have significant set-up costs often involving new access or highways infrastructure, therefore they need to apply for a permission allowing them to operate over a sufficient period of time to be economically viable. For crushed rock sites in particular, this is usually much longer than the minimum landbank period outlined in the NPPF. Again this could mean that landbanks may seem to contain more reserves than the required figure. This issue is discussed in more depth within the Local Aggregates Assessment and Minerals Technical Evidence Paper.

4.2 Crushed rock in Gloucestershire

4.2.1 There are two main geological resource blocks for crushed rock in Gloucestershire which are currently worked.

Figure 1: Location of existing planning permissions for crushed rock quarries

4.2.2 These are Carboniferous limestone in the Forest of Dean and Jurassic limestone in the Cotswolds. Historically approximately 70% of the crushed rock has been produced from the Forest of Dean and 30% from the Cotswolds. Both resource blocks provide aggregates for general construction purposes, but the Carboniferous limestones are also of a
high enough quality to be used in high-specification concrete and road-based products such as asphalt and coated roadstone.

**Crushed rock resources and quarries in Gloucestershire**

4.2.3 The NPPF states that *as far as is practical* landbanks should be maintained from outside certain designated areas including AONBs (Paragraph 144). In Gloucestershire almost all of the Jurassic limestone resource lies within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a significant proportion of the Carboniferous limestone is within the Wye Valley AONB. While the existence of the AONB designation is a significant disadvantage the question of whether an allocation should be made in the revised plan remains, with particular emphasis on whether allocations should be retained/made in the Cotswolds resource area. The emerging spatial strategy in this consultation document suggests that it is appropriate and sustainable to make provision in the Cotswold resource area to meet local provision. As well as providing for aggregates, the quarries within the AONB also provide for other construction products that contribute to the local vernacular and character of the Cotswolds AONB. Given that the MLP 2003 was looking to limit significant mineral working to 2 sites and there are no other non AONB sources of Cotswold limestone available to maintain a contribution, there is a strong argument for maintaining the historic provision from within the AONB.

4.2.4 As the plan is a 15 year plan there are two issues to consider:
- Sufficient provision should be made to meet demand until the end of the plan period.
- Sufficient provision to maintain a rolling landbank throughout the plan period.

4.2.5 For Crushed rock that means the following provision needs to be met
- Period from 2013-2030 (1.6mt x 18 years = 28.8mt)
- Ten year landbank at the end (2030) of the plan period (16mt)

4.2.6 This means a total of 44.8mt of crushed rock needs to be provided for through the MLP. The Dec 2012 reserves figures stood at 29.73mt. As 28.8mt are required from 2013 to the end of the plan period, which means that technically the reserves could last to the end of the plan period (without taking account of issues such as productive capacity), but more reserves would definitely be required to maintain a landbank beyond the end of the plan period (15.07mt).

4.2.7 However, it should be noted that there is an imbalance of reserves across the county. Historically around 70% of crushed rock has been produced from the Forest of Dean and 30% from the Cotswolds. The 2012 annual survey of crushed rock quarries in the county shows that as at 31 December 2012 permitted reserves amounted to c.29.73mt, of
which 18.10mt are associated with the Forest of Dean quarries and 11.63mt with quarries in the Cotswolds. Applying the second LAA’s countywide requirement of 44.8mt to 2040 shows that overall an additional 15.07mt of permitted reserves would be needed for this period but if the lower amount of 28.8mt to 2030 is required, then permitted reserves are just sufficient. This is outlined in Table 3 below.

4.2.8 If the same calculation is used for the two resource areas by using their individual permitted reserves, a shortfall of just over 2mt is evident for the Forest of Dean by 2030, but a surplus of 3mt is calculated for the Cotswolds. However, shortfalls in both areas are evident if provision for a 10 year landbank post 2030 is included in the calculations (13.26mt in the Forest of Dean and 1.81mt in the Cotswolds). However, deliverability issues indicate shortfalls in productive capacity in the Forest of Dean from 2018 and 2026 in the Cotswolds, so the overall landbank only provides part of the background for future provision.

Table 3: Summary of County & Resource Area Crushed Rock requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Area</th>
<th>A Permitted Reserves as at 1/2013</th>
<th>B Requirement for period 1/2013-12/2030</th>
<th>B-A Shortfall (surplus)</th>
<th>C Requirement for period 1/2013-12/2040</th>
<th>C-A Shortfall (surplus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean</td>
<td>18.10mt</td>
<td>20.16mt</td>
<td>2.06mt</td>
<td>31.36mt</td>
<td>13.26mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswolds</td>
<td>11.63mt</td>
<td>8.64mt</td>
<td>(2.99mt)</td>
<td>13.44mt</td>
<td>1.81mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>29.73mt</td>
<td>28.8mt</td>
<td>(0.93mt)</td>
<td>44.8mt</td>
<td>15.07mt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Sand and gravel in Gloucestershire

4.3.1 Historically around 95-98% of the sand and gravel produced in the county has been extracted from the Cotswold Water Park in the Upper Thames Valley, with some extracted elsewhere either in the Severn Vale or more historically in the Windrush valley in the Cotswolds. There has also been some solid sand extracted in the Bromsberrow Heath area. The sand in the Severn Vale differs in composition slightly to that in the UTV, it is predominantly a softer sand mainly used for building sand, whereas the sand extracted from the UTV tends to be mainly sharper sands used for concreting aggregates.

4.3.2 For Sand & Gravel the provision requirements equate to

- The period from 2013-2030 (0.83mt x 18 years = 14.94mt)
- Seven year landbank at the end (2030) of the plan period (0.83mt x 7 years = 5.81mt).
4.3.3 This means a total of 20.75 mt of sand and gravel resources need to be provided for through the MLP. The Dec 2012 reserves figures stood at 6.02 mt and therefore an additional 8.92 mt of sand and gravel is required to the end of the plan period at 2030. This means that there is already a shortfall (without even taking account of issues such as productive capacity), and further reserves would be required from 2030 to maintain a seven-year landbank beyond the end of the plan period (5.81 mt), giving a total shortfall of 14.73 mt. Historically the majority of sand and gravel production in the county has been from the Upper Thames Valley with the production from the Severn Vale representing less than 5% of total sand and gravel production over recent years. However, the resource in the Severn Vale does contain sand with a slightly different chemical composition that makes it suitable for wider construction uses whereas the sand in the UTV tends to be more generally used for making concrete.

Further information relating to the process behind identifying the figures for Gloucestershire can be found in the following documents:
- Minerals Technical Evidence Paper
- First Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) & Baseline to LAA and Second LAA
- National Planning Policy Framework
- National Planning Policy Guidance

4.4 Site allocations

4.4.1 To ensure that the landbanks can be maintained with sufficient productive capacity throughout the plan period it is clear that new sites
will need to be permitted for both crushed rock and sand and gravel. The purpose of identifying allocations within a plan is to ensure that future mineral working will be in the most appropriate locations and that all stakeholders, including mineral operators and the local community, have a degree of certainty in the potential planning application process. In line with National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014) the County Council proposes that the potential shortfall in provision for aggregate minerals is met through formal site allocations contained in the MLP.

4.4.2 However, **just because a site is allocated within a plan, it is not automatically guaranteed planning permission.** Mineral operators must still undertake the full planning application process and demonstrate to the stakeholders and decision makers that they can satisfy all policy requirements (including national policy) and ensure that any site-specific constraints have been adequately mitigated before planning permission would be granted.

4.4.3 Considerations of the earlier consultation stages relating to aggregates can be found within the *Minerals Technical Evidence Paper*. The paper identifies two strategic policy aims for meeting the need of primary aggregates and identifying future supply areas taking into account issues such as ensuring there is sufficient productive capacity within each individual resource areas taking account of issues such as the historic production levels and the need to maintain separate resource blocks in the county (e.g. Forest of Dean/Cotswolds for crushed rock and UTV/Severn Vale for sand and gravel).

4.4.4 Unlike with other types of allocations such as for waste or housing, minerals can only be worked where they occur and frequently the minerals occur in constrained locations. Minerals also occur in varying qualities within these locations. For example in some crushed rock locations there are more soils and clays (known as overburden) above the minerals than in others meaning that the minerals are found deeper, or in other locations there are layers of unusable materials such as silts and clays lying between the layers of rock meaning that there is increased waste and more cost to the operator. In sand and gravel areas some terraces of sand and gravel are deeper than others or some resources are found in areas which have high water tables or flood frequently meaning that some locations are more economically viable than others.

4.4.5 These kind of issues are not always evident from geological maps and require borehole testing to ensure that there are actual minerals in place of a suitable quality and quantity to make it economic to work. This type of testing is expensive and tends to be undertaken by minerals operators or landowners when looking for prospective sites. Therefore the County Council has already undertaken an exercise over the last couple of years where we have asked the minerals industry and landowners to submit
sites which they consider are suitable for strategic aggregates extraction. In addition sites were allocated in the former 2003 MLP and any parcels of land from the plan which remain unpermitted have also been considered in this process.

4.4.6 There are a total of 18 sites from a combination of these unworked preferred areas and new sites submitted. Some sites contain more than 1 parcel of land. Each site is summarised within this document with an opportunity for you to comment on its suitability. There is a background evidence paper to support this which explores the factual issues surrounding the site.

The evidence paper supporting the site selection process is the Site Options Evidence Paper:
Further information relating to the geology and also the enduses for aggregates in Gloucestershire can be found in the following documents:
Local Aggregates Assessment
Local Aggregates Baseline Assessment
2003 Adopted Minerals Local Plan
Minerals Safeguarding Evidence Paper
Minerals Technical Evidence Paper

4.4.7 It should be noted that all sites which have been suggested to the County Council are included in this Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation. Therefore no decisions have been made on any of the sites and they are not presented to you in any order of preference. They are presented by resource type then by location and the earlier numbers are in the order of those within the 2003 MLP with any new sites following on in the order which they were presented to us.

4.4.8 There will be questions following each site description which enable you to comment on that site. As with all questions in this consultation you are not obliged to answer all of them, please feel free just to answer the questions most relevant to you. The feedback from stakeholders will assist the County Council in deciding which sites might be suitable to take forward as formal allocations in the draft pre-publication MLP.

4.4.9 The proposed strategic policy aim and proposed policy for aggregates are outlined below:

**Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals-Meeting the Need**
Subject to economic, environmental and social considerations, provision for an adequate and steady supply of aggregates will be made to maintain a landbank of at least 10 years for crushed rock and 7 years for sand and gravel for the period to 2030. The required provision is based on the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) but this will be kept under review and will be subject to annual monitoring through the rolling LAA process. Where a shortfall in the
landbank becomes apparent a review of the plan may be triggered.

**Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals - Identifying Future Supply Areas**

1. For crushed rock appropriate areas in the Forest of Dean (FoD) and in the Cotswolds will be identified in the MLP based on a 70:30 division of the Local Aggregates Assessment requirement.

2. For sand and gravel the main focus for the provision of the requirement of the Local Aggregates Assessment will be the Upper Thames Valley (UTV). Appropriate areas for this supply will be identified in the MLP which also acknowledges that some local supply may be required from the Severn Vale.

**Supporting Text for Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals - Identifying Future Supply Areas**

The LAA will be updated on an annual basis, therefore the quantities could change annually. Worked examples of how this strategic policy aim would work are shown below based on the figures identified within the second LAA.

For Crushed Rock, the second LAA identifies an annual crushed rock provision of 1.6mt which equates to 1.12mtpa from the FoD and 0.48mtpa from the Cotswolds based on a 70:30 proportional split in supplies. Subject to the consultation on site options and the eventual ‘testing’ of site allocations it is anticipated that the bulk of provision for crushed rock will be made in the finalised plan through preferred areas in the respective resource areas.

For Sand and Gravel, the LAA identifies an annual sand and gravel provision of 0.83mt and that over the last 10 years approximately 95-98% of supplies have been provided from the UTV. As for crushed rock, it is anticipated that the finalised plan will contain preferred areas for the provision of sand and gravel. These will be generally based within the UTV. Provision outside the UTV will either be made through allocations only where these have been tested and found to be environmentally acceptable.

**Proposed Policy for Preferred Areas for Aggregates**

Proposals for the extraction and/or processing of crushed rock and sand and gravel within the Preferred Areas identified in the MLP will be permitted where:

i. The mineral is required to maintain the landbank requirements throughout the plan period

ii. The key development criteria of the plan are satisfied (to be agreed after the consideration of which allocations are taken forward following the sites options and draft policy framework consultation).
The Preferred Areas are:

i. **Forest of Dean (Crushed Rock)** - (preferred areas to be inserted after consideration of the consultation on site options and indicated through the preparation of the pre publication Draft MLP)

ii. **Cotswolds (Crushed Rock)** - (preferred areas to be inserted after consideration of the consultation on site options and indicated through the preparation of the pre publication Draft MLP)

iii. **Sand and Gravel** (preferred areas to be inserted after consideration of the consultation on site options and indicated through the preparation of the pre publication Draft MLP)

4.4.10 The sites are split into four main areas as shown in the box below:

1. Crushed Rock, Forest of Dean
2. Crushed Rock, Cotswolds
3. Sand & Gravel, Upper Thames Valley
4. Sand & Gravel, Severn Vale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRUSHED ROCK SITES</th>
<th>Cotswolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest of Dean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cotswolds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFD1: Stowe Hill/Clearwell</td>
<td>CRCW1: Daglingworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFD2: Drybrook</td>
<td>CRCW2: Huntsmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFD3: Stowfield</td>
<td>CRCW3: Three Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFD4: Hewelsfield</td>
<td>CRCW4: Oathill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAND AND GRAVEL SITES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Thames Valley</strong></td>
<td><strong>Severn Vale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW1: Dryleaze Farm/Shorncote</td>
<td>SGTW1: Page’s Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW2: Cerney Wick</td>
<td>SGTW2: Redpools Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW3: Horcott/Lady Lamb Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW4: Kempsford/Whelford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW5: Down Ampney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW6: Charlham Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW7: Wetstone Bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCW8: Spratsgate Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site number and name: CRFD1: Stowe Hill/Clearwell
**Site description:**
The site is located near the village of Clearwell and to the west of the small hamlet of Stowe Green in the Forest of Dean. There are three parcels (Areas A-C on the plan) being considered as potential extension areas to the existing Clearwell/Stowe Hill Quarry (Area D). The existing quarry comprises two parcels and currently produces a range of limestone products including both aggregates and non-aggregates.

A preferred extension area was allocated within the former Minerals Local Plan. The majority of this area now benefits from a minerals planning permission (DF/2238/X) granted in January 2007 (which is subject to an application for variation of conditions that is currently being considered by the MPA – ref 09/0073/FDMAJM). There is a residual area which did not form part of that planning application (Area A).

All three proposed parcels are currently used as farmland. There is a mixture of grazing and arable. Some trees are present on the site and there is a working farm within Area B.

The plant and access route is currently located within the northern “Clearwell Quarry” but the site has recently been granted permission to relocate the plant to the southern “Stowe Hill Quarry” (Parcel D South) with a new access route onto the B4228 (09/0072/FDMAJM). In January 2014, the County Council issued a scoping opinion (13/0079/SCOPE) in relation to a proposed extension that was not intending to use the new access. The proposed extension covers all of Parcel B and most of Parcel A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
<th>A) 10 hectares</th>
<th>B) 48 hectares</th>
<th>C) 137.5 hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Potential yield**
The operator is in the process of re-assessing the resource potential of Areas A and B. Area C is thought to contain in excess of 10mt, but this is unconfirmed. The scoping opinion request which included part of Areas A & B did not provide any updated figures, but suggested that it could extend the quarry life by at least 15 years.

**Environmental & other considerations:**
The three parcels combined cover a vast area and it is likely that phased site extensions could extend well beyond the plan period. As the quarry has recently changed ownership the new owners are in the process of re-evaluating the potential reserves within the quarry. It is likely that, subject to suitability, parcels A and B could come forward within the plan period and be sufficient to maintain productive capacity at Clearwell Quarry to 2030 and potentially beyond. Therefore it is anticipated that Parcel C would only contribute to longer-term landbank requirements.

Landscape: Parcel A is part of the unworked preferred area and as such is part of the plateau feature that is concealed.
from long distance views by Orles Wood to the south and from other directions by the dip of slope and current quarry screening bunds. Parcel B covers part of land that dips East and South. As the land falls away it does not benefit from the same sort of screening for close to medium viewpoints as the 2003 MLP preferred area. Therefore significant landscape mitigation might be required. As some longer distant viewpoints are from higher ground such mitigation would need to assess the potential impact from those locations and develop mitigation accordingly. Parcel C includes a mixture of pasture and dipping land that depending on what parts are worked will require assessment of potential impact and appropriate mitigation. Assessment and scope of returning to agricultural land is likely to be required.

Highways: capacity is currently restricted to 600,000tpa. Parcels A and B in particular have potential to be worked by either existing or replacement plant/access. In particular the new access would provide benefit to local amenity of the residents in Stowe Green. Therefore if any further areas of working were to go forward they are likely to require to be conditioned on using the new access, which is yet to be implemented. Parcel C would potentially be worked by land access for conveyor tunnel under the B4228. To minimise impact on the wider highway network, the limitation to output capacity is likely to be around 600,000tpa.

Public Rights of Way may need diversions and/or temporary closures.

There are nearby properties (including one within the proposed site boundary for Parcel B) and the potential amenity impacts to these properties would need to be considered and mitigated where necessary.

For any future mineral working, there are nearby sites of geomorphological/ecological interest and therefore assessments of these would be required. In particular any future proposals would need to assess the potential impact to the Slade Brook SSSI. Archaeological assessments would also be required.

There are potential hydrological issues, some linking to Slade Brook SSSI and therefore assessments linked to these would also be required.
Site number and name: CRFD2: Drybrook
### Site description:

The proposed site (Area A on the above plan) is located near to the villages of Drybrook and Ruardean. It is currently used as farmland and contains some planted woodland. There are also some properties within the site boundary. There is an underground gas pipeline running through the centre of the site. The site is adjacent to Drybrook Quarry (Area B) which is currently mothballed and the permission is due to expire in April 2014. Whilst it was operational, Drybrook Quarry produced a variety of limestone aggregate products and a certain amount of plant and buildings remain on the site. It is anticipated that the proposed site would only be considered as a potential extension area to Drybrook Quarry.

### Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare) | 11 |

### Potential yield

| Potential yield | Total site c.4.5mt (c.3.2mt up to the gas pipeline) |

### Environmental & other considerations:

Any working in the allocated site would require similarly substantial planting and landscaping to mitigate longer term landscape impacts. There are also the following issues which would need to be resolved through a planning application:

- Highways
- PRoW
- Amenity impacts
- Ecology/Biodiversity
- Archaeology
- Hydrology

The original allocation suggested that any proposals would require all aggregate to be processed through the existing plant at Drybrook Quarry. Should this site be carried forward into the new MLP it is likely that these criteria could still be applied for this site and output limit should be restricted to 350,000 tpa. However, Drybrook Quarry is mothballed with the permission due to expire. Without a new permission to keep the quarry live, it calls into question the deliverability of the site.

There are advantages in that this site has potential to utilise existing plant and infrastructure at the site. It is possible that 7-8 years reserves remain in the quarry. The unworked preferred area could provide between 10-15 years additional reserves subject to the ability to move the gas pipeline. Therefore given that and subject to a new permission being obtained, the existing reserves along with the unworked allocation at this quarry could contribute to the landbank throughout and beyond the plan end date of 2030.
Site number and name: CRFD3: Stowfield
**Site description:**

The site is located near Staunton in the Forest of Dean. There are some properties located close to the site boundary. The site (Area A) formed part of a preferred area allocation in the 2003 MLP as a proposed extension to Stowfield Quarry (Area B) and consolidation of Stowfield Quarry and the previously dormant Rogers Quarry. The consolidation and extension has now been permitted and area A is a residual area which did not form part of that planning application. The site is currently forestry land.

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare): | 3 |
| Potential yield | Unknown, but not likely to be significant. |

**Environmental & other considerations:**

Although the area forms part of an unworked preferred area, it is an area that may impinge upon or impact on statutory designations for archaeology (SAM) and ecology (SSSI). If it was possible to work any additional land this has the advantage of being an extension to the existing working and therefore plant and access infrastructure is in place. The current operator is not promoting this site which cast the deliverability of actually working the land into doubt. The MLP (2003) suggests the possibility of working below current depth restrictions, but the operator considered and discounted this in the current planning permission, therefore this too would appear unlikely and undeliverable.

It should be noted that the existing reserves at the quarry are likely to cover the plan period to c.2030 and possible beyond subject to limitations on production output.

Furthermore should any mineral working be considered (in addition to archaeology as highlighted above) there are other issues which would also need to be addressed including:

- Landscape
- PRoW
- Ecology
- Hydrology
Site number and name: CRFD4: Hewelsfield
**Site description:**
The site is located within the parish of Hewelsfield in the Forest of Dean. The site was originally promoted as an omission site in the MLP (adopted 2003). The site was considered by the Inspector at the MLP Public Inquiry, but he did not recommend that the site should be included in the MLP. The Council adopted the plan and did not include the site in accordance with the Inspector’s recommendations. An EIA scoping opinion was issued in 2002 for a proposal for minerals extraction, but no planning application ever came forward.

**Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):** 36

**Potential yield** c.26mt

**Environmental & other considerations:**
The landowner is promoting the site. However, there does not appear to be any mineral operators associated with the site at the present moment in time. This would mean that if the site was allocated through the plan process and was granted permission, realistically it would be unlikely to be operational during the early part of the plan period due to the time required for negotiating operational contracts or obtaining planning permission. Any pre-commencement conditions or construction works generally associated with setting up a new site in a greenfield location could delay operational phases even further. The agent representing the landowner has confirmed that there could be a 10-year lead-in time from including in the plan to starting working. Being very optimistic if the site went forward it would be unlikely to contribute to the landbank until the very late stages of the plan period and would largely contribute towards the period post 2030.

The main advantage of this site is that it could contribute a significant quantity of good quality resource (Lower Dolomite Carboniferous Limestone), to ensure a strategic contribution of construction material to the local economy and potentially sub-regionally. The disadvantage is that any contribution would be more likely in the longer-term, probably beyond the plan period. However if the site went forward it would introduce a major new quarry where one doesn’t currently exist which brings with it all the potential associated environmental impacts, some of which might have potential to be controlled, while others would be less easy to mitigate. Of these issues, the highways difficulty, appears very significant to overcome. While a solution via a new access road from the B4228 to the strategic road network has been suggested in the past, this is a significant development in its own right, the suitability of which is uncertain.
With the land being within the Wye Valley AONB, is a significant constraint and given the NPPF policy on mineral working in the AONB, very special circumstances need to be made to justify allocations within such designations. This might include a demonstrable 'need' for the mineral and whether there was the lack of sources of supply outside of the AONB.

There are other constraints, not least of which is the potential impact on the adjacent local community, the feeling of which was made quite evident in the preparation of the former MLP (2003).

Overall, there are concerns over deliverability of the site, particularly during the early stages of the plan period due to current lack of mineral operator interest. There are other issues which would also need to be addressed through a planning application:

- PRoW
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- Water protection/hydrology
- Scope for conservation of soils and return to agricultural land through restoration
Site number and name: CRCW1: Daglingworth
Site description: The site is located just off the A417 near Daglingworth in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Area B on the plan is the existing Daglingworth quarry. Area A is the proposed extension area and is currently agricultural land whereby some advanced screening has already been undertaken along the northeastern edge of the field. It is separated from the existing quarry by an old bridlepath containing a mature trees. Daglingworth Quarry currently produces a range of limestone products including both aggregates and non-aggregates.

Area A was allocated as a preferred area in the former MLP. There is no other minerals related planning history on the site apart from a 2002 pre-application enquiry relating to archaeological advice. The adjacent Daglingworth quarry benefits from mineral planning permission until February 2042.

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare): | 17 |
| Potential yield | The 2003 MLP estimated the potential yield for the extension area as approximately 9 million tonnes. |
| Environmental & other considerations: | The current mineral operator at Daglingworth Quarry has indicated that they would still like to promote the site and that there are no land ownership constraints preventing this. If the site is carried forward a number of criteria for development could be considered for retention subject to review and capacity. |

There are significant advantages associated with this former MLP (2003) Preferred Area due to the existing plant and access infrastructure. The operator has suggested that reserves exist under the plant, but that they would need to move the plant into the base of the quarry (also a key long-term benefit reducing landscape impact through the plant removal from the skyline) However they would need to seek approval of working the unworked preferred area to make the proposal viable overall. The operator has suggested that this would be required in the latter half of the plan period.

The site lies within the AONB. While the existence of the AONB designation is a significant disadvantage the question of whether an allocation should contribute to be retained in the revised plan remains with whichever allocations should be made in the Cotswolds resource area. The emerging spatial strategy in this consultation document suggests that it is appropriate and sustainable to make provision in the Cotswold resource area to meet local provision. Although providing for
aggregates the quarry provides for other construction products that contribute to the local vernacular and character of the Cotswolds AONB. Given that the MLP 2003 was looking to limit significant mineral working to 2 sites, there are no other non AONB sources of Cotswold limestone available to maintain a contribution. Therefore there are advantages to this site in that many of the potential issues have been 'tested' previously through the 2003 MLP process.

Retention or diversion of the PRoW would be required.

There are nearby ecological and geodiversity sites and assessments would be required in relation to this.

There are archaeological remains which need to be preserved in situ, other archaeological assessments would be required and a tunnel would require constructing under the PRoW to enable preservation.

There are potential hydrological issues which would need to be assessed.

There are no other apparent constraints in relation to deliverability of the site.
Site number and name: CRCW2 Huntsmans
**Site description:**
The site is located within a fairly remote part of the Cotswolds AONB. Three parcels of land have been considered through this process, all of which are currently used for agricultural purposes.

Parcels A and B lie within Temple Guiting parish and Parcel C lies within Naunton parish.

Parcels A and B were allocated in the former minerals local plan. The area shown as a current quarry within Parcel A has a permission to a much smaller depth for mainly tiling stone (Tinker’s Barn – indicated as existing quarry ‘E’) and is being operated by a different mineral operator to the main Huntsmans Quarry. Parcels A and C have been submitted by the operator and are considered more deliverable than Parcel B which is not currently under the control of Huntsmans Quarry.

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare): | A) 55 |
| B) 13 |
| c) 39 |

| Potential yield | A) 8.2-10.5mt |
| B) c.2.5mt |
| C) Up to 10mt |

**Environmental & other considerations:**
The operator has confirmed that reserves are likely to be exhausted in the plan period and indeed the condition of the current planning permission anticipates an end date of 2027. Therefore any land allocated could be available in the latter part of the plan period. However some land in A while available for quarrying is not necessarily in control of the operator, therefore deliverability might be a factor despite being tested in the MLP (2003) and being allocated as a preferred area. The operator has a preference for parcel C although this was not tested through the previous MLP (2003). Parcel B is not being promoted by the operator and furthermore might prove unviable due to potential archaeological constraints present. Any allocation at this site does have the advantage of existing plant and access being in place.

AONB – The site lies within the AONB. While the existence of the AONB designation is a significant disadvantage the question of whether an allocation should contribute to be retained in the revised plan remains with whichever allocations should be made in the Cotswolds resource area. The emerging spatial strategy in this consultation document suggests that it is appropriate and sustainable to make provision in the Cotswold resource area to meet local provision. Although providing for aggregates the quarry provides for other construction products that contribute to the local vernacular and character of the
Cotswolds AONB. Given that the MLP 2003 was looking to limit significant mineral working to 2 sites, there are no other non AONB sources of Cotswold limestone available to maintain a contribution. Therefore there are advantages to this site in that many of the potential issues have been ‘tested’ previously through the 2003 MLP process.

There could be deliverability issues associated with the existing small building stone quarry (Tinkers Barn) which is currently operated as a tiling stone quarry by a different operator and is located within Parcel A.

There are other issues which may also need to be addressed:
- PRoW
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- Water protection/hydrology
- Assessment of agricultural land quality and scope for progressive restoration to agriculture where appropriate.
- Parcel C has not previously been considered so if it was taken forward it may require further work to be undertaken (for example landscape assessments).
This site is a separate operational Quarry (Cotswold Hill) but under different ownership to Three Gates Quarry.
**Site description:**
The site is located near Ford in the Cotswolds AONB. The proposed area has been submitted as a potential extension to Three Gates Quarry which is currently inactive (but adjacent to an existing active building stone quarry under control of a different mineral operator). The parcel in question is at present being used for agricultural purposes.

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare): | 8 |
| Potential yield | 3.5-4.5 mt |

**Environmental & other considerations:**
The site has been promoted by the operator and is theoretically deliverable. However, the operator has suggested this mainly as a contingency should any land at their main Huntsmans Quarry prove unsuitable. Discussion with the operator has suggested that they may withdraw this suggestion depending on whether any land can be retained for allocation at Huntsmans Quarry.

This site has a number of disadvantages not least that it is currently inactive therefore has no real infrastructure or suitable access in place.

Apart from the issue of deliverability highlighted above there are also other issues which may need to be addressed:
- Location within the AONB – while accepting in principle that the spatial strategy is looking to make provision within the Cotswolds resource area and hence the AONB, the Council would only want to allocate sufficient sites to meet provision in the plan period. If other potentially more advantageous sites can be allocated, this site is not likely to be required.
- Highways
- PRoW
- Amenity impacts
- Ecology
- Geodiversity
- Archaeology
- Water protection/hydrology
Site number and name: CRCW4 Oathill
### Site description:
The site is located in the Cotswolds AONB in Temple Guiting Parish. The site is proposed as a potential extension to the existing Oathill Quarry which is predominantly produces minerals for non-aggregate purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
<th>15.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential yield</td>
<td>1-2mt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental & other considerations:
Following discussions with the operator who has confirmed that this is principally an important quarry for building stone supply (which was the main reason for suggesting the site) although part of the business does crush some waste rock mainly for agricultural lime purposes. The use of stone for marketing as aggregate is fairly low. Given all these factors it suggests a fairly small-scale contribution for aggregates purposes. The site is predominantly producing non-aggregate products and not considered to be a significant aggregate producing quarry.

The same AONB issues apply but should a proposal come forward it is likely to be treated principally as a building stone operation.

Should an application come forward for the proposed area, the following issues may need to be addressed:
- Highways
- Ecology
- Geodiversity
- Archaeology
- Water protection.
Site number and name: SGCW1 Dryleaze Farm/Shorncote

This area is considered under SGCW8 Spratsgate Lane
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site description:</strong></th>
<th>The site is located in the parish of Siddington in the Cotswold Water Park, near to the existing Shorncote Quarry. It is a small parcel of land that was allocated in the former MLP but did not come forward as part of the Dryleaze Farm extension. It is an agricultural field containing some trees and a drainage ditch which is adjacent to the Dryleaze Farm extension to Shorncote Quarry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential yield</strong></td>
<td>Unknown (but not likely to be a significant amount).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental &amp; other considerations:</strong></td>
<td>There are doubts over the deliverability of the site, both due to landowner/operator interest and the small size of the site. Unless it was considered as a potential extension to the existing workings, it is likely that the small size of the site could make it uneconomical to work. If the site was operated as an extension to Shorncote and did not increase the existing annual output then it is unlikely that there would be highways issues, but a transport assessment would still be required. There could also be potential amenity impacts. It is possible that there could be ecological, geodiversity and archaeological issues which would need assessing prior to permission/extraction. There are flooding and hydrological issues which would need addressing through any planning application along with agricultural land quality. This could be a particular issue in regards to restoration given that the site lies within the statutory aerodrome safeguarding zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong></td>
<td>The site is located within the Cotswold Water Park in the parish of South Cerney. The site was allocated as a preferred area in the former minerals local plan (2003). The surrounding parcels of land have been permitted for mineral extraction, but the site itself is still relatively flat agricultural land with mature hedgerows and trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential yield</strong></td>
<td>The yield was estimated in the former local plan as 0.5 million tonnes (depending upon the outcome of hydrological investigations).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Environmental & other considerations:** | The mineral operator of Cerney Wick and Oaktree fields is not currently planning to pursue the preferred area and have actually sold off part of the site. The mineral operator has suggested that the mineral resource potential is much more limited than previously considered, therefore there could be questions over the deliverability.  

A transport assessment would be required.  
PRoW diversions would be required.  
There are ecological issues which need considering, particularly in relation to North Meadow.  
A strategy for archaeological assessment/preservation would need to be in place.  
Consultation with the MoD would be required and restoration must need to take account of the birdstrike risk along with the agricultural land quality. There are flood/hydrological issues which also need to be mitigated and restoration proposals could be challenging in order prevent birdstrike without increasing floodrisk elsewhere. |
Site number and name:  SGCW3 Horcott/Lady Lamb Farm
| **Site description:** | The two parcels are located near to RAF Fairford in the Cotswold Water Park and are within the parish of Fairford. The two parcels of land are both currently being used for agricultural purposes. They were both allocated in the former minerals local plan and nearby parcels have been permitted for mineral extraction including one parcel that was also allocated in the MLP.

There is no history of sand and gravel extraction on the actual two parcels. The two parcels were originally allocated as potential extensions to the nearby Horcott Quarry but this has now closed (working ceased in 2012) and is undergoing restoration. |
| **Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):** | A) 48  
B) 27.5 |
| **Potential yield** | c. 2.6mt |
| **Environmental & other considerations:** | The owners of Lady Lamb Farm have still confirmed potential interest in the site going forward in the process. Neither parcel is being promoted by a mineral operator. The parcels were originally allocated in the MLP (2003) as potential extension areas to Horcott Quarry, but this has now closed and is in restoration. Therefore there is a question over deliverability as there does not appear to be any mineral operator interest in either parcel.

If the parcels were to be worked in isolation, the suitability of the highways and the potential limit to highways capacity must be established. This will be a key issue as to whether the parcels of land can operate as stand-alone operations. Public Rights of Way could be affected on Parcel A. Ecology and biodiversity issues must be assessed. There is a chance that there will be some significant archaeology on the site and a strategy for this must be established.

There is a large percentage of known best and most versatile agricultural land to be considered.

The MoD must be consulted in regards to both birdstrike and instrument landing - birdstrike mitigation is essential for restoration purposes. There could be hydrological issues which may need assessing, particularly in association with the restoration proposals. |
Site number and name: SGCW4 Kempsford/Whelford
Site description:
The site is located close to RAF Fairford in the Cotswold Water Park. All parcels fall within the parish of Kempsford. The site comprises several parcels of land, all of which were previously allocated as preferred areas in the 2003 MLP. The majority of the proposed areas outlined above could be worked as potential extensions to the existing Manor Farm Quarry site which is located adjacent to RAF Fairford and accessed via Washpool Lane.

Most of the parcels are relatively flat farmland punctuated with mature treelines/woodland, watercourses/drainage ditches and the occasional old building. Area D contains landing lights for RAF Fairford. Area C has been promoted by the mineral operator and has been subject to an EIA scoping opinion and the subsequent planning application was submitted in early 2014.

Area A is a small area which was adjacent to the former Stubbs Farm Quarry (now in restoration). It is a relatively small parcel of agricultural land.

Area B is located the opposite side of Washpool Lane to Manor Farm and is currently used for agricultural purposes.

Area C is the area which the operator of Manor Farm has proposed as a preferred extension area. It consists of relatively flat arable land with some mature hedgerows and drainage ditches. There is an old barn within the area, but the applicant has indicated it would be excluded from the forthcoming application. The applicant has also indicated that the mature black poplars would be retained as part of the same application.

Area D is currently leased to the MOD, it is a relatively flat arable field and contains landing lights used in association with the runway at RAF Fairford.

Area E consists of predominantly pastureland and is separated from Area F by the River Coln. Nearby uses include a converted barn now used as a wedding venue.

Area F consists of a mixture of agricultural land and planted woodland north of the River Coln. It was part of the Preferred Area for Kempsford/Whelford in the adopted MLP (2003) and was envisaged as a possible extension to the mineral workings in the north.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half)</th>
<th>Parcel A</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel A</td>
<td>Parcel B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hectares</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential yield</td>
<td>Parcel A - unknown</td>
<td>Parcel B - unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total area up to 6 million tonnes (including parcel C) as estimated in the adopted MLP (2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental & other considerations:**

- **Parcel A** – As highlighted under the archaeology section, this area was excluded from an earlier application due to the presence of Roman archaeology. The adjacent extraction area at Stubbs Farm is undergoing restoration. The small size of the site may also mean that it is potentially unviable.

- **Parcel B** – Although it is a residual parcel of a larger unworked preferred area, there has been no landowner or mineral operator interest received so far in this process, meaning that the potential deliverability of the parcel is questionable.

- **Parcel C** – There is known operator interest on this parcel and a recently submitted planning application for 3.2mt. It is therefore potentially the most deliverable parcel in the area. Overall Parcel C may come forward in the early stage of the plan-period. Subject to planning permission being obtained, other unconstrained and economically viable parcels of land also need to be considered as potentially contributing in the plan-period.

- **Parcel D** currently contains lighting associated with the runway at RAF Fairford which could impact upon the potential deliverability of this parcel.

- **Parcels E and F** - Although the parcels are residual parts of the larger unworked preferred area, the proximity of the River Coln and Jenner’s Farm field might impact upon the potential quantity of sand and gravel resources available in these areas. The operator of Thornhill Farm/Coln Quarry is no longer interested in parcel E therefore this site might not be able to contribute until the latter part of the plan period.

*Generally applicable to all parcels*

The parcels are all existing preferred areas there are already reasonable distances between potential working areas and
sensitive properties and uses. However there would still be issues to consider carefully at any potential application stage. It should be noted that these potential land allocations avoid the Upper Thames Valley village settlement protection zones of Kempsford and Whelford.

Highways – It is anticipated that any parcels coming forward would be as an extension to existing operations and unlikely to increase existing road movements. Existing access and infrastructure are significant advantages. However, a transport assessment would still be required.

Public Rights of Way may be affected.

Ecology/biodiversity – there are nearby wildlife sites which would need to be considered in terms of both as a constraint and in restoration opportunities.

Archaeology – the entire site is located within an area of known archaeological interest.

There is a large percentage of known best and most versatile agricultural land to be considered.

MoD – due to the close proximity of RAF Fairford, birdstrike is an issue that needs considering as would the proximity to bomb storage facilities. Water-based restoration could be an issue with regards to birdstrike.

Flooding – there are flooding and water management issues to be considered on the site. There may be opportunities to manage or enhance flood water capacity. The restoration methods may require careful consideration particularly if there is importation of inert materials. There will be a significant issue to reconcile both flood risk and birdstrike issues through restoration design.
Site number and name: SGCW5 Down Ampney

For this area please refer to SGCW6 Charlham Farm

For this area please refer to SGCW7 Wetstone Bridge
**Site description:**
The site is located within the central part of the Cotswold Water Park, entirely within the parish of Down Ampney. The entire site forms a significant part of the Down Ampney Estate which is currently being farmed. There is a mixture of pasture, woodland and arable land. It was an airfield during World War II but is no longer used for military purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
<th>a) 91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential yield</td>
<td>c.10mt in Gloucestershire (excluding parcels D and E in Wiltshire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental & other considerations:**
The site (all parcels) has been promoted by the mineral operator who has an option on the land including Parcels D and E in Wiltshire. A planning application has been submitted on Parcels A, D, E, but has not yet been determined. Parcel B did not form part of the planning application and remains and “island” within the application area.

Many of the issues associated with parcels A, D and E are being considered through the planning application. Therefore most of the concerns flagged here related to parcel C.

Land proposed has taken account of village settlement protection zones of Down Ampney and Charlham Farm. However satisfactory controls to any amenity impacts would need to be established for any proposals which come forward, particularly for those properties which are very close to the site.

There could be highways restrictions. Clearly if permitted the application on parcel A could add c.2.7mt to the Gloucestershire landbank. Subject to the timing of any planning permission and given the rate of extraction and phasing of A, D, and E it could be anticipated that Area C would potentially come forward in the plan period. Public Rights of Way may also be affected.

Ecological, archaeological and transport assessments would be required. There is a large percentage of best and most versatile agricultural land to be considered.

The site lies within the safeguarding zone for RAF Fairford and there would need to be birdstrike mitigation and as there could also be flooding/hydrological issues which would need to be resolved, therefore the restoration proposals could be challenging on some parts of the indicated land.
Site number and name: SGCW6 Charlham Farm
### Site description:
The site (parcel A) is located in the central Cotswold Water Park area within the parish of Down Ampney. The site is presently used as farmland. There is no existing infrastructure in place. The landowner has indicated that the land would need to be worked in conjunction with parcels B and C (in Wiltshire) and anticipates that the most likely access and plant location would be through parcel B.

The site currently appears to be farmland, mainly flat grassland with some mature hedgelines.

### Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):
- **147.5 (parcel A only)**

### Potential yield
- **4-5mt**

### Environmental & other considerations:
The landowner has promoted the site, but it does not appear to have mineral operator interest at present. The agent for the landowner has confirmed that as this is the same landowner as the Down Ampney land (SGCW5) it is unlikely to be considered until the planning situation and development of that land can proceed. Therefore it is anticipated that this land might only contribute towards the latter stages of the plan period. Therefore there could be issues surrounding the deliverability of the site.

Ecological, archaeological and transport assessments would be required and PRoW would need diverting. The site also falls within the landing zone for RAF Fairford. There is a large percentage of best and most versatile agricultural land to be considered.

There could be flood/hydrological issues which would need addressing. Given the birdstrike issues, restoration could be a challenge to minimise risk considering that this is coincident with a floodrisk zone and wet afteruses are more likely.

Amenity impacts for Down Ampney and Poulton might need to be considered carefully if this site is taken forward. In particular the village settlement protection zone of Down Ampney.
Site number and name: SGCW7 Wetstone Bridge (Whetstone Bridge)

For this area please refer to SGCW5 Down Ampney
**Site description:**
The site is located in the Cotswold Water Park within the parish of Down Ampney. Flat agricultural land, bordered by hedgerows. There are very few isolated properties some very distant. Marston Meysey is less than 500m away from the site at the nearest point.
The site which the operator wishes to promote also includes an area of land within Wiltshire which has been included for illustrative purposes. There is an undetermined planning application on both parcel A (Gloucestershire) and parcel B (Wiltshire). The applicant is also in control of an existing quarry site in Wiltshire (parcel C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Potential yield | Gloucestershire c. 0.6mt  
Wiltshire c. 0.3mt |

**Environmental & other considerations:**
As this is a currently planning application the various issues associated are being considered as part of that process. Notwithstanding the outcome of the planning application, the following issues may need to be addressed:
- Birdstrike/restoration proposals and landing requirements for RAF Fairford.
- Archaeology
- Ecology
- Flooding/water protection
- Highways

In particular there is a need to strike a balance between restoration proposals that minimise the risk of birdstrike but do not increase floodrisk in the area. If planning permission is granted the site would make a contribution to both the landbank and productive capacity for a large part of the plan period.
Site number and name: SGCW8 Spratsgate Lane

This area is discussed under SGCW1 Dryleaze Farm/Shorncote
**Site description:**

The site is adjacent to the Keynes Country Park to the east and Spratsgate Lane to the west within the parish of Somerford Keynes. Three fields of flat pastureland bordered by hedgerows. There is an undetermined planning application on the site. Gloucestershire County Council as the MPA included this site as a preferred area in its Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan and Revised Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan. However, the Inspector recommended in his Inspectors Report that the site be deleted from the plan. The MPA agreed to the recommendation to delete the site, but stated in the Gloucestershire County Council Consideration of the Inspector’s Report that “Removal of the Preferred Area does not rule out the possibility of an application coming forward however it would have to satisfy the policies of the Plan. And in particular considered against the criteria of Policy A4.”

A planning application was submitted in 2008 (08/0016/CWMAJM) to extract sand and gravel, but later withdrawn.

A further application (*Progressive extraction and processing of sand and gravel with restoration using imported inert fill to a mix of wetland, grassland and recreational use, together with replacement visitor parking and access for the Keynes Country Park*) was submitted in 2009 and granted approval in 2010. However the decision was quashed in 2012 by the High Court due to a procedural technicality and the same application has been resubmitted and is currently being consulted upon with a decision expected in the near future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential yield</td>
<td>283,000 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; other considerations:</td>
<td>Notwithstanding the outcome of the planning application, the following issues may need addressing. These include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amenity to users of the Country Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water protection/Flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Birdstrike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agricultural land quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these matters are being considered and potentially addressed through the current planning application. If the permission is granted the site could contribute towards the landbank early in the plan period. Albeit a relatively small reserve strategically given the requirements of the future plan period. Nevertheless given the limited amount of sites coming
forward and the addition to productive capacity for 3-4 years the site makes some contribution towards the plan requirements overall. It should also be noted that the NPPF also points towards not having all reserves tied up in a few sites due to competition and flexibility (Paragraph 145).
Site number and name: SGTW1 Page’s Lane

For this area please refer to SGTW2 Redpools Farm
**Site description:**
The site is located in the parish of Twyning within the borough of Tewkesbury. There is a highway running through parcels A and B. All three parcels also abut the lane running between Twyning and Church End. At present all three parcels are worked as farmland. There have been a number of applications (including Parcels A and B) for sand and gravel refused at the site dating back to the late 1980s. A further planning application has been submitted but as yet undetermined on Parcel B.

| Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare): | A) 6 | B) 5 | C) 1 |
| Potential yield | A) c. 200,000 tonnes | B) c. 100,000 tonnes | C) estimated c. 50,000 tonnes |

**Environmental & other considerations:**
Assessments would be required for ecology and archaeology and any potential issues overcome. There could potentially be hydrological issues. PRoW are affected. Highways improvements would be required. Agricultural land quality to be considered.

Taken individually these parcels have a relatively small yield for allocation as Preferred Areas, given the strategic scale of provision for S&G required. Nevertheless given the different mineralogy of this resource compared to other sand & gravel resources in Gloucestershire and also the potential to provide material for local supply are matters to consider whether any of these sites should be allocated in the plan.

Amenity of local properties has been a key reason for the refusal of previous applications to work sand and gravel at the site. The ability of an operator to devise a scheme to work this site in such a way as to minimise potential impacts is critical as to whether any of these parcels can either be allocated or would succeed in obtaining planning permission in the future. Therefore deliverability of this issue is a key matter to consider regarding the suitability of the site. It should be noted that for parcel B the issues will be considered through the currently submitted planning application.
Site number and name: SGTW2 Redpools Farm

Bow Farm in Worcestershire under control of same landowner/operator

For these areas please refer to SGTW1 Page’s Lane
**Site description:**
The site is located in the parish of Twyning, close to the county boundary with Worcestershire. An area on successive river terraces adjacent to the River Severn floodplain. Most of the land is pasture while the higher stages such as D are arable. The central area of D is potentially sand and gravel bearing land but the applicant envisages it being safeguarded as an access route for Parcels A and C and in other longer-term a more significant minerals resource (2.5mt estimate) at Bow Farm in Worcestershire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate site area (to nearest half hectare):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential yield**
Combined estimate of all parcels to be around 450,000-500,000 tonnes according to the operator.

**Environmental & other considerations:**
There are issues which may need to be addressed. All of these matters would require assessment in respect to the suitability of this site:
- Highways
- Water protection/flooding
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- PRoW

Agricultural land quality to be considered
Potential impact to adjacent sensitive uses and properties which need to be considered.

It should be noted that the resources at Page’s Lane are in the ownership of the same operator. The operator has suggested a potential phasing of working land at Page’s Lane (but subject to successful planning permission) and then moving to Redpools Farm. Once Redpools Farm has worked the operator envisages the same plant and access (most likely in Parcel D) serving the Bow Farm site in Worcestershire. It should be noted that Bow Farm is not allocated therefore the outcome of that site is a matter for Worcestershire County Council. It is unclear as to whether this might also affect deliverability.
4.5 Unallocated sites

4.5.1 Although it is anticipated that the majority of provision will be made through Preferred Areas /Site Allocations, there is also a need to provide a draft policy framework for dealing with proposals for the working of aggregates which might come forward outside Preferred Areas. This enables the plan to be flexible enough to meet landbank requirements should any of the allocations fail to gain permission or if a new site becomes available that is more deliverable than the allocations. There is more detail on the background to mineral working outside preferred areas contained within the Minerals Technical Evidence Paper. The following policy is proposed for dealing with any aggregates proposals outside of allocated areas:

Proposed Policy for Proposals for the Working of Aggregates Outside of Preferred Areas

Proposals for the extraction or processing of crushed rock or sand and gravel aggregates outside the identified Preferred Areas will be permitted where:

- It can be demonstrated that the contribution will address a shortfall in the relevant landbank; or
- It can be demonstrated that the need for the mineral cannot be met from another more sustainable source and that the proposed operations will result in an overriding environmental or community benefits in Gloucestershire; or
- the proposal is only of a small scale or is to enable the maximum recovery of any residual resource adjacent to an existing quarry.

Further information can be found in the Site Options Evidence Paper and the Minerals Technical Evidence Paper.

Additional information may also be found in the 2003 adopted Minerals Local Plan.

4.6 Alternative Aggregates

4.6.1 There are alternative sources to primary aggregates such as marine-dredged aggregates, secondary aggregates obtained as a by-product from some other industrial process such as colliery spoil or china clay waste, or recycled aggregates obtained from crushed and screened construction, demolition and excavation wastes.
4.6.2 In Gloucestershire the main source of alternative aggregates is through crushed and screened construction and demolition wastes. The production of secondary aggregates in the county has generally been associated in the main with the limited recovery of shale and harder rocks from colliery spoil tips, but this has not occurred for some time. Crushing of waste minerals from building stone quarries is classed as primary aggregates for reporting purposes and is therefore not included. With regards to marine dredged aggregates, although the marine boundary does extend into Gloucestershire there are no marine licenses issued within the county or any operator interest in Gloucestershire.

4.6.3 Overall, the second LAA estimates that the total production of alternative aggregates is around 100,000 tonnes which represents under 5% of the total 2012 aggregates sales. As all alternative aggregates currently produced in the county are associated with crushed inert wastes, there is a linkage with the Waste Core Strategy (WCS) (adopted November 2012) because some of the WCS policies provide a significant proportion of the policy framework required for dealing with applications for alternative aggregates. This includes Policy WCS4 Inert Waste Recycling and Recovery which would apply to the majority of recycled aggregate applications, Policy WCS8 Landfill which could apply to any soils separated from construction, demolition & excavation wastes when being processed into recycled aggregates and Policy WCS11 Safeguarding Sites for Waste Management which would safeguard the fixed recycled aggregate sites.

4.6.4 It is considered that aspects of the policies proposed in this document for minerals restoration, minerals safeguarding and development management would complete the policy framework for alternative aggregates and that there is no need for any separate alternative aggregates policies.

Further information relating to the geology and also the enduses for aggregates in Gloucestershire can be found in the following documents:
- Local Aggregates Assessment
- Local Aggregates Baseline Assessment
- 2003 Adopted Minerals Local Plan
- Minerals Safeguarding Evidence Paper
- Minerals Technical Evidence Paper
4.6.5 A strategic aim has been identified for alternative aggregates

**Strategic Policy Aim for Alternative Aggregates**

Subject to the development management policies and criteria of the MLP, and Core Policy WCS4 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy, the County Council will support the development of secondary and fixed recycled aggregates facilities in Gloucestershire in order to provide a network of sites to augment the supply of primary aggregates extracted in the county. This will include the safeguarding of existing sites under Core Policy WCS11 and the proposed Safeguarding Policy for Minerals Infrastructure.
Section 5: Non-aggregate minerals

5.1 Non aggregate mineral production in Gloucestershire

5.1.1 The various geological resources present including for non-aggregate purposes in the county have been discussed under Section 3. Some of these resources are extracted for a variety of purposes other than the construction aggregates as covered in Section 4.

5.1.2 Jurassic limestone is used for building, walling and tiling stone as well as being crushed to use to make agricultural lime. The Carboniferous limestone is also used for building and walling stone and agricultural lime. It has an additional use to the Jurassic stone in that it is suitable for certain industrial processes. The sandstone is just used for building and walling stone in Gloucestershire.

5.1.3 Clays are extracted for brick making and engineering purposes and some small-scale coal extraction occurs by Freeminers in the Forest of Dean.

What do we need to provide for?

5.1.4 Historically sites have not been formally allocated for non-aggregate quarries in Gloucestershire (although some of the crushed rock quarries may also produce some non-aggregate products). Often the technical requirements for materials, particularly with building stone and clays, is quite specific and the same resource can vary considerably within a relatively small area. Therefore detailed technical assessments are generally undertaken before an operator would consider applying for planning permission and allocating a site in a MLP without such information could be difficult on several levels.

5.1.5 Any applications for non-aggregate quarries whether for new sites or extensions to existing sites have been previously dealt with in the 2003 MLP under specific non-aggregate policies containing a list of criteria that a proposal must meet in order to gain permission (along with meeting requirements of other applicable policies within the plan).

5.1.6 It is proposed that new NPPF compliant policies are included within the Minerals Local Plan to determine any future applications for non-aggregate minerals.

5.2 Building & roofing stone

What is building stone?

5.2.1 The working of natural building and roofing stone is an important part of the mineral industry in Gloucestershire. The majority of building stone is produced from the Jurassic limestones in the Cotswolds with a range of sandstones and some Carboniferous limestones also produced in the
Forest of Dean. These stones are important for maintaining the character of traditional Gloucestershire villages and have a variety of uses (including building ‘dimension’ stone, roofing slates, dry stone walls and paving slabs) as well as providing resources for new builds and restoration of important historic buildings.

5.2.2 The colour, texture and quality of the resource blocks can be highly variable even within an individual quarry and the stone is usually hand sorted according to end-uses. Some of the building stone quarries are quite small and they are only permitted to produce stone for building purposes. In these quarries stone that is unsuitable for building purposes is generally backfilled into the quarry as part of the restoration scheme. Some of the larger building stone quarries may produce a wider variety of quarry products such as agricultural lime, concrete block making or small quantities of aggregates. However, some of the significant aggregate producing quarries also produce useful quantities of stone for building purposes.

5.2.3 Although it is recognised that building and roofing stone quarries play an important role in Gloucestershire’s economy and maintaining its heritage, it is not proposed to allocate any sites for building and roofing stone within the MLP. No sites were allocated in the 2003 adopted MLP and there are no policy requirements under the NPPF to maintain a landbank for building stone resources. Furthermore the proposed policy options for mineral safeguarding should ensure that a policy framework will be developed within the MLP so that an appropriate level of resource is protected for future use. Any applications for new building stone quarries or extensions to existing quarries which have been considered since the adoption of the 2003 MLP were considered against a specific policy (NE1) and a replacement for this policy is required to ensure that there is an adequate policy framework for this to be considered against. Therefore the policy outlined below is proposed:
Proposed Policy for Building Stone

“Proposals for the winning and working of the county’s key natural building and roofing stones will be permitted only where:

- it can be demonstrated that the need for the stone cannot be met adequately from existing reserves and that the proposals are predominately for the production of stone to be used as a natural building or roofing stone; and

- any winning and working of rock for non building stone use is a by-product, and is ancillary, to the production of the natural building or roofing stone and is confined to that of overlying or interbedded waste stone that has to be removed in order to work the natural building materials or waste stone arising from the dressing of the building stone and which is unsuitable for on-site landscaping or for use in the reclamation of the site; and

- they will help to conserve the historic built environment in Gloucestershire and to maintain its local distinctiveness or are to be used in the conservation of buildings built of the same or similar materials; and

- the proposals demonstrate that the winning and working will increase or maintain employment in Gloucestershire and make a positive contribution to maintaining the rural economy.

5.2.4 It is not considered that a separate policy is required for other non-aggregate quarry products such as agricultural lime, concrete block-making or industrial limestone as historically these outputs tend to be by-products of either building stone or aggregates extraction. Therefore any applications these minerals would be need to be considered in the context of the appropriate policy for the principal type of extraction at the site. In addition some processes may require ancillary development at the site and this would need to be considered in the context of the development management policies.

⚠️ Please refer to the Minerals Technical Evidence paper for further discussion on building and roofing stone including consideration of earlier consultations

Additional information can also be found in the following documents listed in Section 1.
5.3 Clay

Clay production in Gloucestershire

5.3.1 Clay extraction in Gloucestershire is currently either for the purpose of brickmaking or engineering purposes. The UK’s brickmaking industry has been in decline since the 1960s and this is mirrored in Gloucestershire which now only has 2 remaining active brickworks.

5.3.2 The use of clay for engineering purposes is predominantly for the use on-site at landfill sites, although at one site there is a limited export for use as clay lining for example for flood defences and watercourses.

5.3.3 Nevertheless clay is an important national resource which is recognised within the NPPF. Although no sites for clay extraction are proposed for the MLP, there are proposals for safeguarding clay resources (see Section 3 of this report). As with building and roofing stone (discussed above) there was a policy in the 2003 adopted MLP (NE2) and this needs to replaced in order to ensure there is an adequate policy framework in place for any applications for clay extraction to be determined. As such the two policies below have been proposed, one for brick clay and one for engineering clay:

**Proposed Policy for Brick Clay**
Proposals for the extraction of brick clay will be permitted subject to no adverse environmental, amenity, transport or other impacts arising from the proposals. Proposals for clay extraction in Gloucestershire for the manufacture of bricks outside the county will also need to demonstrate that the proposal is the most sustainable option for the export supply of clay.

**Proposed Policy for Engineering Clay**
Applications for the extraction of clay for engineering purposes will be permitted:
- where the requirements of the general minerals policies of this plan are satisfied and the need for clay is demonstrated; and
- where the proposals include provision for the phased restoration of the
site within an acceptable timeframe without the need for the importation of fill materials; or

- in the case of clay extraction at an existing mineral site, where the proposal is to use the clay on site and its extraction will not extend the duration of mineral extraction at the site and will not delay restoration or be otherwise detrimental to the restoration potential of the site or the implementation of approved restoration plans.

Please refer to the Minerals Technical Evidence paper for further discussion on clay including consideration of earlier consultations. Additional information can also be found in the following documents listed in Section 1.

5.4 Energy minerals (including mineral exploration)

Energy minerals in Gloucestershire

5.4.1 At present Coal is the only mineral currently extracted in Gloucestershire for the purpose of generating energy, this is mainly undertaken on a small scale by Freeminers⁸ in the Forest of Dean where coal is present at relatively shallow depths. Other coal resources exist in Gloucestershire (Newent and Cotswolds) but these have never been extracted and currently do not appear to be economically viable.

5.4.2 There is the possibility that both conventional oil and gas and unconventional hydrocarbons (i.e. extracted via methods such as fracking for shale gas) are present in the county, but this largely remains unexplored (except for six deep exploratory boreholes dug between 1975 and 1990 in the Cotswolds and Forest of Dean for conventional

---

⁸ Freeminers are registered under the Dean Forest Mines which outlines very specific requirements for becoming a Freemininer (such as being over the age of 21, having been born in the Hundred of St Briavels and having worked for a year and a day in a mine).
Before a planning permission for exploration and extraction of hydrocarbons can take place various licences and consents are required from the Department of Energy and Climate Change. It should be noted that currently there are no licences for such activity in Gloucestershire.

Please refer to the Minerals Technical Evidence paper for further discussion on energy minerals including consideration of earlier consultations. Additional information can also be found in the following documents listed in Section 1.

5.4.3 The 2003 MLP included a policy framework for coal and hydrocarbons. Taking account of representations made to the earlier consultations and more recent up-to-date issues considered within the Minerals Technical Evidence Paper. The following policies for energy minerals are now proposed.

**Proposed Policy for Small Scale Coal Underground Mines**
Proposals for small scale coal underground mines, which contribute to the cultural and industrial heritage of the Forest of Dean will be permitted where they are environmentally acceptable in accordance with the other policies of this plan.

**Proposed Policy for Opencast Coal**
Proposals for the extraction of coal by opencast methods in the Forest of Dean will not be permitted unless it is environmentally acceptable. In particular this would include being able to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact on public access, sensitive land uses, public amenity, settlements, tourism and recreation and the economic regeneration of the area.

**Proposed Policy for Re-working of Colliery Spoil Tips**
Proposals for the re-working of colliery spoil tips for coal or other minerals will not be permitted unless they are environmentally acceptable. In particular proposals should accord with the other policies of the MLP and during the extraction period or following the completion of extraction as appropriate they provide an improvement to the landscape quality, wildlife interest and/or industrial heritage of the Forest of Dean.

**Proposed Policy for Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons**
Proposals for the exploration, appraisal and production of conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons or for the underground storage of gas or carbon will be permitted only where the development does not adversely affect the environment or harm local communities, accords with all other relevant planning policies and includes detailed plans and proposals covering the duration of operations, removal of all buildings, plant and equipment and the restoration of the site.
Section 6: Environmental Considerations

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The MCS Preferred Options consultation (2008) presented an option MPO10, for The Environment. The feedback received indicated that there should be a clear differentiation between the historic environment and other forms of the environment. This section discusses the key areas originally envisaged under MPO10. It now proposes separate policies, where appropriate, for each environmental consideration along with a policy framework for other matters such as for transport and development management.

6.2 The Water Environment

6.2.1 Gloucestershire is estimated to have 5284 km of watercourses, a widespread and important resource. There is a strong relationship between rivers and particular minerals in that sand and gravel resources are often present in river valleys. There are three main catchments into which all Gloucestershire’s rivers and streams flow: the Lower Severn; the Lower Wye and the Upper Thames.

6.2.2 Furthermore much of Gloucestershire is underlain by a principal aquifer with high to intermediate vulnerability. Groundwater is an important resource and forms part of the natural water cycle that is present within underground strata.

6.2.3 Both the rivers and floodplains are illustrated in the image below:
6.2.4 It is important to ensure that water quality (of both surface watercourses and aquifers) is not negatively affected by mineral development. This can be avoided by putting an adequate buffer zone in place between mineral development and watercourses and/or placing a depth restriction, where appropriate, to prevent breaching of the water table. In relation to flood risk, sand and gravel extraction is considered to be water compatible development and other forms of minerals extraction tend to be less vulnerable which means that they can occur in all flood risk zones except flood zone 3b. Mineral sites can also potentially contribute to flood alleviation through schemes for wet restoration.

Please also refer to Section 3.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the water environment and minerals development in much greater detail.

6.2.5 It is considered necessary to have two separate policies for the water environment, one for flood risk and one for water quality. These are outlined below:

**Proposed Policy for Flood Risk**

In order to reduce the likelihood and impact of flooding both on and off-site proposals which are classified as 'less vulnerable' may come forward in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3a although the sequential approach will still apply.

Proposals for minerals-related development within Flood Zone 3b (the functional floodplain) will not be permitted other than 'water compatible' proposals such as sand and gravel workings, providing it can be demonstrated through an FRA that will be no:

i. net loss of floodplain storage
ii. impediment to water flows
iii. increase in flood risk elsewhere.

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required for all development of 1 hectare or more and for any proposal located within Flood Zone 2 and 3a. The FRA should consider all sources of potential flood risk.

The design of all new development and restoration schemes will be required to take account of current and potential future flood risk from all sources both on and off-site including in particular the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).
**Proposed Policy for Water Quality**

Mineral development which is likely to have a significant negative quantitative and/or qualitative impact on the water environment, will not be permitted unless appropriate measures can be imposed to mitigate any harmful effects.

Where mineral working is to be permitted, an appropriate buffer zone must be retained between the mineral working and adjacent significant watercourses to preserve the integrity of the water corridor in terms of conservation and landscape. The size and landscape treatment of the buffer zone will depend on the characteristics of the area and details of the proposals.

6.3 **AONB/Landscape**

6.3.1 Gloucestershire, being a predominantly rural county, contains some high value and unique landscapes. Over 50% of the county is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the highest percentage of any county in the UK. There are three areas of AONB within the county, the Cotswolds AONB, the Wye Valley AONB and the Malvern Hills AONB. In addition to the AONB there are also other high value landscape areas such as the ancient Forest of Dean and the Severn estuary.
6.3.2 The whole county (included the designated areas) is divided into landscape character areas. These in turn help to define the character or style of a particular area. For minerals development this can be of particular importance when determining whether a proposal can be sufficiently mitigated through the restoration and afteruses.

Please also refer to Section 4.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with landscape protection and minerals development in much greater detail.

6.3.3 Notwithstanding the earlier discussions in Section 4 regarding potentially making provision for aggregates within the AONB, it is important that the landscape of Gloucestershire is protected, this has been discussed in more detail within the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper and the following policy has been proposed.

**Proposed Landscape Policy**

*General Landscape*

Proposals for minerals development will be permitted where they do not have a significant adverse effect on the local landscape as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment* or unless the impact can be mitigated. Where significant adverse impacts cannot be fully mitigated, the social, environmental and economic benefits of the proposal must outweigh any harm arising from the impacts.

*Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)*

Proposals for minerals development within or affecting the setting of the Cotswolds, Wye Valley and Malvern Hills Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:

1. there is an overriding need for the mineral, including national considerations,
2. it does not adversely affect the local economy,
3. there are no less environmentally constrained alternative sources of supply which could be developed at reasonable cost,
4. any impact on the special qualities of the AONB as defined in the management plan (including on the landscape setting and recreational opportunities) can be satisfactorily mitigated, and
5. that landscapes can be restored and, where possible, enhanced in the longer term.

In the case of major development within the AONB, a proven public interest must be demonstrated. Planning permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances following the most rigorous examination and subject to the criteria above.
The County Council will continue to work in partnership with the respective AONB Conservation Boards and/or Joint Advisory Committees to help deliver the vision and objectives of the AONB Management Plans and Minerals Local Plan.

* http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/109519/Landscape-Character-Assessments

6.4 Green Belt

6.4.1 There is an area of green belt in Gloucestershire between Gloucester and Cheltenham. The purpose of the green belt is to preserve the open character of the land between Cheltenham and Gloucester and to prevent them merging, it is serves the same purpose between Cheltenham and Bishop’s Cleeve.

6.4.2 Mineral working in Gloucestershire’s green belt has occurred on a very small scale for sand and gravel and also clay, some of the working has taken place in association with restoration of landfill/landraise sites. At present there are just two sites in the green belt with valid permission to extract minerals.

6.4.3 As mineral working is of a temporary nature and land can potentially be restored to its previous state, it is not necessarily contrary to the purpose of the green belt designation. However, there should be an effective policy in place to ensure that should mineral working occur within the green belt, it is carried out to the highest possible environmental standards and that harm does not occur. The following policy is proposed.

Proposed policy for Mineral Working in the Green Belt.

Proposals for mineral working within the Gloucester-Cheltenham Green Belt will be permitted provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Proposals will need to demonstrate that they can be carried out to the highest environmental standards and that the site of any mineral working can be restored quickly to a beneficial afteruse.

There will be a presumption against proposals for mineral working that would constitute inappropriate development within the Gloucester-Cheltenham Green Belt except where it can be demonstrated that there are very special circumstances. Such circumstances will not be considered to exist unless the totality of the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other relevant considerations.

Please also refer to Section 5.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the green belt and minerals development in much greater detail.
6.5 Nature Conservation (Biodiversity and Geodiversity)

6.5.1 Gloucestershire is renowned for the diversity and scenic beauty of its landscape and biodiversity. There are many internationally, nationally and local designated sites within the county covering a vast area. These include Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Ramsar sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Key Wildlife Sites. It is important to protect both the habitats and the species within them, but it is recognised that biodiversity cannot be effectively sustained if the only goal is to protect and manage designated areas. Where possible development should be integrated into the wider landscape so that it is supportive to biodiversity rather than being hostile.

Wood Anemone  7 spot Ladybird

6.5.2 Mineral working can play a significant role in the protection and enhancement of biodiversity. This is emphasised in the NPPF paragraph 143 which states that policies should ensure ‘high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place’. Therefore the following policy for biodiversity and geodiversity has been proposed:

Proposed Policy for Biodiversity & Geodiversity

Overarching Policy
All minerals development proposals will be required to assess their impact on biodiversity and geodiversity. Developments should conserve, and seek to enhance where possible, the natural environment through the creation, restoration and beneficial management of ecological networks, important geological exposures, green spaces, priority habitats and populations of priority species. Proposals that incorporate beneficial biodiversity or geological features into their design and layout will be favourably considered particularly where the proposal would result in a positive contribution to the Gloucestershire Nature Map or any locally recognised Nature Improvement Area.

Development will not be permitted unless avoidance, mitigation and, exceptionally where appropriate, compensation measures are provided such that the net impacts are reduced to a level below which they no longer outweigh
the benefits of the development.

**Designated Sites and Protected Species**

Minerals development proposals should be supported by sufficient information to help determine whether they would result in a likely significant effect upon any European or internationally important site designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site, either alone or in combination with other projects and plans. Minerals development likely to have a significant effect will only be approved if it can be ascertained, by means of Appropriate Assessment, that the integrity of any European or internationally important site will not be adversely affected.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserves (NNR) will be safeguarded from inappropriate minerals development. Planning permission for minerals development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or National Nature Reserve (NNR) will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that:

- The development would not conflict with the conservation, management and enhancement of the site unless the harmful aspects can be satisfactorily mitigated; and
- The benefit of the development clearly outweighs the impacts that the proposal would have on the key features of the site; and
- In the case of a SSSI, there would be no broader impact on the national network of SSSIs.

Local nature conservation designations including Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Local Sites (which in Gloucestershire include Key Wildlife Sites (KWS) and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS)) will be safeguarded from inappropriate minerals development. Planning permission will only be granted for development affecting such local nature conservation designations where it can be demonstrated that the impact of the development can be satisfactorily mitigated and that the benefit of the development clearly outweighs any impact.

Development proposals that would adversely affect legally protected European Protected Species (EPS) or Nationally Protected Species will not be supported unless appropriate safeguarding measures can be provided.

1 Habitats and Species of Principal Importance in England, Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act

Please also refer to Section 6.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the biodiversity and geodiversity in the context of minerals development in much greater detail.
6.6 Historic Environment

6.6.1 Gloucestershire has a rich and varied historic heritage, much of which lies buried beneath the ground. The surviving elements of the archaeological resource and the historic environment are vulnerable, finite and non-renewable. Once destroyed, they can never be replaced and those who manage the environment have a duty of care, on behalf of both current and future generations. Minerals developments have the potential to obliterate or diminish this resource. Valuable archaeological sites, historic buildings or historic landscapes can be damaged, destroyed, or contaminated, or sites disconnected from their landscape context irretrievably compromising their setting and value.

Excavated Roman graves at Horcott Quarry

6.6.2 The continuing need for mineral extraction requires a balance to be achieved between the protection of the archaeological resource and the historic environment, and the need for essential development. This balance can be achieved through the application of legislation, policy and planning guidance, in conjunction with a sound knowledge of the nature of the archaeological resource and the historic environment. This serves as the framework against which informed judgments can be made regarding future minerals development. The following policy has been proposed along with suggested development management criteria for the Historic Environment:
Proposed Policy for the Historic Environment

Planning permission for mineral development that would have a significant adverse impact upon heritage assets including their integrity, character and setting will only be granted:

(i) the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impact that the proposal would have on the key features of the site; or
(ii) the proposal includes adequate measures to mitigate those impacts.

There will be a presumption in favour of the conservation of the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings, and of those non-designated heritage assets with archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance. In the case of other non-designated heritage assets the benefits of the development proposal will need to be weighed against the scale of harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset.

Proposed Development Management Criteria for the Historic Environment

Pre-validation/determination:
A description of the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their settings, together with an assessment of the impact of the proposals. Where heritage assets with archaeological interest are present, or there is potential for them to be present, a desk-based assessment and a field evaluation will be required.

Post-permission: Mitigation of the loss of the significance of any heritage assets and their settings through preservation and/or an appropriate programme of investigation, recording, publication and archive deposition.

Please also refer to Section 7.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the archaeology and minerals development in much greater detail.
6.7 Transport

6.7.1 Mineral transportation in Gloucestershire is largely dominated by road haulage. All existing active quarries are linked to their markets by the road network. Minerals can only be worked where they occur and this generally means that there can be very limited scope to proactively move away from road transport.

6.7.2 Transport is a major issue when considering proposals for mineral development as the generation of significant amounts of road traffic can and does have negative impacts on the amenity of the local community and the environment. The main transport infrastructure routes are illustrated below:

Transport Infrastructure in Gloucestershire

6.7.3 To ensure that the transport of minerals is adequately considered through the planning process a sustainable transport policy is required. This is outlined overleaf:
Proposed Policy for Sustainable Transport

In the interests of sustainable development and minimising the impact of mineral development on Gloucestershire’s roads and the wider natural and historic environment, proposals for mineral-related development that utilise alternative modes of transport such as rail and water will be positively supported. This is subject to compliance with other relevant development plan policies and the contribution to a sustainable development system for Gloucestershire.

All mineral related development must be supported by a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment (TA). Consideration will also be had to the location of the proposed development and the level of HGV movements in determining whether a TA is required. Development that would have an adverse impact on the highway network (such as highway safety and operation, residential amenity or the local environment) which cannot be mitigated will not be permitted.

Where a Travel Plan is required the developer will be expected to enter into a Section 106 or unilateral legal agreement to secure the development of the travel plan and any contributions required to support its implementation. A contribution towards costs of monitoring the travel plan will also be required.

Please also refer to Section 8.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the sustainable transport and minerals development in much greater detail.
Section 7: Minerals Restoration

7.1.1 Mineral working is considered to be a temporary use of land, in so far as the use of a quarry for mineral extraction will cease once the mineral reserves are exhausted. Without proper management quarrying can irreversibly damage the environment. It is therefore important that land worked for minerals should not become derelict and out of use for any longer than is absolutely necessary.

7.1.2 The reclamation of mineral workings has many advantages. For instance it can:
- bring worked out land back into productive use to support and benefit the economy
- help to create new habitats and enhance and protect existing ones
- reduce and prevent mineral dereliction and protect landscapes

7.1.3 It is important that the minerals restoration needs to be considered in the context of the local landscape character areas and other local issues. There has been a concentration of minerals development in the Cotswolds Water Park since the early 20th century and it has been considered in a strategic context through early documents like the Upper Thames Plan and Cotswold Water Park Biodiversity Action Plan. Given the strong association between this area and mineral working it is considered necessary to include both a strategic aim for restoration in the Cotswold Water Park. This is considered important given both the cross-administrative boundary nature of the minerals resource (with Wiltshire and Swindon) and that the bodies such as Cotswold District Council have an important role to play in the restoration of the landscape post minerals working.

Proposed Strategic Aim for the Cotswold Water Park.

The County Council will seek to agree with stakeholders and keep under review a collaborative planning mechanism for achieving a landscape scale, holistic approach to determining appropriate reclamation plans and afteruses for mineral workings in the Cotswolds Water Park.

7.1.4 It is also considered necessary for a general restoration policy applicable to all sites including those in the Cotswold Water Park, this is outlined overleaf. In addition a proposed development management policy for restoration is also proposed.
**Proposed Restoration Policy**

Proposals for the reclamation of mineral workings should be consistent with the Plan’s other objectives and the strategic aims. Reclamation proposals will normally be to agriculture, native woodland or nature conservation and, if appropriate, geological conservation and open water for flood alleviation and/or water storage. In all cases mineral workings should be worked and reclaimed in phases to a high environmental standard as soon as practicable after extraction has ceased in each phase in order to secure progressive reclamation across the site and to minimise the amount of land that is used for mineral extraction at any one time.

**Proposed Development Management Restoration Policy**

Proposals for mineral development will be permitted if they are accompanied by satisfactory reclamation proposals which must:

- Take account through a site specific landscape strategy of the existing character and setting of the area and actively seek for opportunities for their improvement. This should also outline the quarry development plan showing direction of working, location of waste materials, areas of visual exposure. It should identify the need for screening during operation and account for the landscape character for the restored landscape
- Provide for after uses which will have benefits to the local community
- Support and diversify the local economy
- Improve the local area by providing for improved public access to the countryside and recreational and amenity public open space and the creation of new public rights of way
- Provide opportunities for the reconstruction, restoration and/or safeguarding of protected lines of affected canals
- Providing net gains for biodiversity including enhancing priority habitat and species
- Aim to protect existing ecological networks and establish coherent ecological networks where appropriate and practicable; biodiversity offsetting should be considered where appropriate and practicable to compensate for residual and unavoidable impacts on wildlife and ecosystems
- Restore the best and most versatile agricultural land back to grade where practicable
- Benefit geodiversity where practicable
- Reclaim the site to a water based afteruse only if appropriate to provide for other opportunities such as improved biodiversity or is justified to meet other objectives such as improved flood alleviation capacity and does not cause civil or military aviation hazard
- Reclamation schemes for new areas of mineral extraction should provide for the use on site of all soils and natural waste arising from mineral extraction and processing operations on site
- Aims to minimise the risk of land instability
Please also refer to Section 9.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper which explores the issues associated with the restoration of minerals development in much greater detail.
Section 8: Other Policies

8.1 Development Management Policies

8.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) covers a range of areas but does not provide specific guidance on what policies local planning authorities should include within their local plans.

8.1.2 The Minerals Local Plan adopted in 2003 included a number of specific development control policies. These have been reviewed through this consultation process and replacement policies have been outlined below. These include which set out the criteria for which mineral development planning applications will be assessed against. It covers a range of areas which are significantly important when considering the suitability of the proposal in relation to social, economic and environmental issues within the county.

8.1.3 The following proposed policy will replace Policy DC1 of the 2003. It ensures that proposed mineral developments do not have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the environment. It will encourage sustainable development. The National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014) provides a framework for a number of matters covered by this draft policy. In a majority of cases negative effects from minerals development in relation to adverse impacts can be dealt with through suitable planning conditions.

**Proposed Policy for Mitigation of Environmental Effects**

Proposals for mineral development will only be permitted where the applicant has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the MPA in consultation with other relevant pollution control agencies, that any potentially adverse environmental and/or pollution effects are capable of satisfactory control and/or mitigation, or elimination.

8.1.4 The following proposed policy will replace Policy DC2 of the 2003 MLP. In some cases ancillary development to mineral working and siting of plant is often required within sites to allow the processing of raw materials. Part 19 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning [General Permitted Development] Order 1995 permits mineral operators to erect or alter ancillary buildings and plant subject to certain restrictions. Where justified in exceptional circumstances the MPA may restrict such permitted rights. The environmental impact of plant and ancillary development must be fully considered and mitigated.
Proposed Policy for Ancillary Development

Ancillary development to proposed or permitted mineral development must satisfy the following requirements that:
1. it is directly related to the extraction of the mineral,
2. its design, size and location should, as far as practicable, be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area,
3. it does not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent land-uses,
4. its life should be limited to that of the mineral working and where appropriate, is dismantled in accordance with the restoration proposal,
5. where appropriate it should allow for the processing of secondary (waste) minerals, and
6. It is in accordance with other policies contained in this Plan.

8.1.5 The following proposed policy will replace DC4 of the 2003 MLP. Due to Gloucestershire having a number of civilian and military aerodromes and associated safeguarding areas it is therefore considered that a policy in relation to this should be included within the Minerals Local Plan. The Minerals Planning Authority will ensure that mineral development is not incompatible with adjacent aerodromes and associated areas.

Proposed Policy for Safeguarding Aerodromes

Mineral development or reclamation proposals for worked out mineral sites, which may pose a hazard to any civilian or military aerodromes, will not be permitted.

8.1.6 The following policy will replace Policy DC5 of the 2003 adopted Minerals Local Plan. Planning obligations offer a mechanism by which development proposals may sometimes be made acceptable by legally committing interested parties to matters which cannot properly be dealt with by conditions attached to a planning permission. They constitute a way of allowing development to proceed with safeguards, environmental improvements or other commitments. They do not constitute a device to enable unacceptable development to be permitted because of unrelated benefits offered by the applicant. The approach concentrates on ensuring the acceptability in planning terms of proposals and should not be misinterpreted as an attempt to negotiate financial or other compensation for individuals or communities. The tests as to whether a planning obligation may be legally applied, and full guidance on the
implementation of planning obligations, are outlined in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

**Proposed Policy for Planning Obligations**

The Mineral Planning Authority will seek to enter into planning obligations with mineral operators to mitigate the negative impacts of mineral development which cannot be satisfactorily resolved by conditions attached to planning permissions. The following may be considered appropriate matters for inclusion in a planning obligation where related to the proposal:

1. highways and access improvement (including maintenance),
2. traffic restrictions,
3. environmental enhancement [including landscaping, habitat and species protection and creation],
4. protection and/or replacement of locally, regionally and nationally important sites of acknowledge importance,
5. replacement of important environmental and landscape features,
6. protection of local amenity,
7. replacement of local community facilities, for example open space, sports and recreation facilities, creation of new public rights of way,
8. protection of other natural resources, for example, the water environment,
9. long-term management and restoration of site, afteruse and monitoring, and/or
10. revocation and consolidation of planning permission.

8.1.7 This proposed policy will replace Policy DC7 of the 2003. Major construction projects, especially road schemes, can demand considerable quantities of aggregate, particularly low grade fill material. In some cases this can be sourced near to major construction projects, which can have advantages over established sites by reducing the impact of concentrated flows of heavy goods traffic on the public highway. A proposal of this nature must be able to demonstrate that it represents the most appropriate source of mineral to meet the additional demand.
Proposed Policy for Borrow Pits

Proposals for temporary borrow pits will be permitted where:
1. it is required for a specific construction project,
2. the proposed site is located in close proximity, preferably contiguous to the specified project,
3. it would minimise disruption to local communities,
4. the site will be satisfactorily reclaimed on completion of the specified project,
5. it can be demonstrated that it will be less environmentally damaging than importing the required material from mineral sites which already have planning permission, and it is in accordance and is consistent with all other development plan policies.

8.2 Other General Development Management Policies

8.2.1 Within the existing Minerals Local Plan there are a number of other policies which would broadly be considered as development management policies. These however have been covered in the relevant other sections of this document. Appendix B shows a table of the 2003 adopted MLP policies and whether they will be replaced by new policies or whether it is considered they are no longer needed. However some other policies which are not covered elsewhere are discussed below.

Cumulative Impact

8.2.2 The potential impacts that a mineral development can have will largely depend on the scale and type activity. Some of the potential impacts associated with mineral uses might include traffic, visual impact, environmental, dust, noise and vibration.

8.2.3 Particular regard must be had to potential ‘cumulative’ impacts. In other words the incremental impacts that may accrue over time as a result of an existing minerals development changing the scale and/or nature of its original permission. The NPPF paragraph 143 indicates that local plans should set out criteria for planning applications to be determined against. One of the indicated categories is *take into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality*. However in the case of mineral working the consideration of cumulative impacts will need to be balanced against the fact that minerals can only be worked where found and that there maybe many other advantages to extensions to existing sites where the infrastructure is in place. The adopted WCS contains a policy on cumulative impact and this has been used as a model for preparing the policy below:
Proposed Policy for Cumulative Impact
In determining proposals for minerals related development the Council will have regard to the cumulative effects of previous and existing minerals development on local communities. Planning permission will be granted where the proposal would not have an unacceptable cumulative impact.
In considering the issue of cumulative impact, particular regard will be given to the following:
1. Environmental quality;
2. Social cohesion and inclusion; and
3. Economic potential.

Within these broad categories this will, subject to the scale and nature of the proposal, include an assessment of the following issues: noise, odour, traffic (including accessibility and sustainable transport considerations), dust, health, ecology and visual impacts.

Agricultural land and soils
8.2.4 The 2003 MLP contained Policy E7 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and this has been revised below to accord with the NPPF (paragraph 143) put in place policies to ensure worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place, including for agriculture (safeguarding the long term potential of best and most versatile agricultural land and conserving soil resources), geodiversity, biodiversity, native woodland, the historic environment and recreation.

Proposed Policy for Soils
Proposals for mineral development which are on agricultural land graded 1, 2, or 3a will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the development cannot be met on poorer quality land. In particular the proposal will need to demonstrate the impact of the mineral working to the local economy. Where a permanent loss of grades 1, 2, and 3a agricultural land can be demonstrated the operator will need to show that they can maximise the conservation of soils and that these will be used in the restoration of the proposal.

Public Rights of Way
8.2.5 The County Council are proposing to take forward policy E17 of the 2003 MLP into the next Minerals Local Plan. Access to the countryside may be affected by mineral development. Public rights of way need to be protected and where affected by development arrangements must be made for suitable diversions in the short term with reinstatement of the
public right of way or a suitable replacement wherever possible in the longer term.

**Proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way**

Mineral development, which affects defined public rights of way, will only be permitted if provision is made for an appropriate diversion unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Mineral Planning Authority considers that such a diversion is not required. Wherever possible long-term reinstatement or suitable replacement of public rights of way will be secured. In addition, the Mineral Planning Authority will not permit proposals, which are likely to materially affect National Trails.

**Buffer Zones**

8.2.6 The Council is proposing on taking forward the existing policy (E14) into the new MLP. Mineral working can have adverse impacts upon surrounding landuses, one way of ensuring that these impacts are minimised is through retention of the buffer zone policy. The policy would ensure that the amenity of local residents is protected. The buffer zones would vary depending on the proposed application and the surrounding land uses. The buffer zone policy is still consistent with guidance provided through the NPPF and the new National Planning Policy Guidance (March 2014). It is therefore considered that the following policy should be taken forward, which is based on an augmentation of the existing policy wording:

**Proposed Policy for Buffer Zones**

In order to safeguard sensitive land-uses, proposed mineral development will not be permitted within an appropriately defined buffer zone. The following matters will be taken into account when delineating the buffer zone at the application stage of development:

1. topography of the site and surrounding areas,
2. natural and manmade features, which may reduce the impact of development, for example landscape features, roads, railway lines etc.
3. the proximity of the proposed development to sensitive land-uses,
4. duration and direction of the proposed working, and
5. location of Plant and other ancillary development.
6. the proposed mitigation measures to be applied.
8.3 Policy Option

8.3.1 The 2003 Minerals Local Plan included a specific policy (E15) for settlement protection boundaries in the Cotswold Water Park. The policy was in place to ensure that the settlements in that area did not become ‘islands’ constrained by mineral working within the Cotswold Water Park area and to protect their setting.

8.3.2 The council are proposing site options in the new MLP within the Upper Thames Valley (Cotswold Water Park) and the settlement protection boundaries are being used as a guiding tool in the preparation of these site options. However it is considered that the aims of the existing policy are covered by the policies that the Council are proposing through this document and the minerals technical paper. Therefore the Council are looking for comments as to whether this policy should be deleted as it is covered by other proposed policies, be kept or be amended.

**Existing Policy E15 Protecting the Local Environment – Cotswold Water Park**

Proposed mineral development, which adversely impacts on local communities and other sensitive land-uses, will not be permitted within Settlement Protection Boundaries identified in Cotswold Water Park.

8.4 Policies not to be retained

8.4.1 There are three 2003 MLP policies which are not being proposed to be replaced in the new MLP.

8.4.2 The first of these is DC3 which the County Council are not proposing to take this forward as the development that it potentially caters for is already covered by core policy WCS4 Inert Waste Recycling and Recovery and core policy WCS8 Landfill of the adopted Waste Core Strategy 2012.

**2003 MLP Policy DC3- Importation of Minerals**

The importation of natural materials to mineral sites will only be permitted where it is environmentally acceptable and it can be demonstrated that there is insufficient suitable waste products arising from the mineral development to carry out all or any of the following:

1. the provision of improved landscaping to enhance the environment and safeguard local amenity,
2. the construction of baffle mounds,
3. the construction and maintenance of site roads,
4. to secure a beneficial afteruse for the worked out mineral site.
5. In the case of brickmaking, additional natural minerals which facilitate the utilisation of minerals extracted on the site.

8.4.3 The second policy not being proposed for replacement is DC6. This is because there was a different set of circumstances and issues that set the context for this policy in 2003 that are not crucial now to require a specific policy. Furthermore planning obligations for schemes in this area will be adequately covered through the proposed planning obligations policy.

**Policy DC6 Planning Obligations – Eastern Spine Road**

The Minerals Planning Authority will seek mineral operator contributions for road improvement if they fall within the tests of Circular 1/97, in proportion to the mineral anticipated to be extracted, where mineral development would generate lorry traffic on the Cotswold Water Park Eastern Spine Road.

8.4.4 The final policy is E18. The County Council are proposing on merging the key points from policy E18 of the 2003 MLP with the proposed draft policies on restoration and planning obligations. The issues that are addressed within the current policy are considered better suited to be included within the two draft policies.

**Policy E18 – Opportunities for Improved Access**

Where appropriate, proposals for mineral development should consider the scope to provide opportunities for:
1. the creation of new public rights of way and/or open space, or
2. the improvement of public access, or
3. the reconstruction, restoration and/or safeguarding of protected lines of affected canals.

8.5 General Development Criteria

8.5.1 When a mineral permission is applied for (whether the site is allocated in the plan or not) certain information will need to be obtained or assessments carried out in advance of the application. If the required information is not supplied at the time of application, the applicant would be asked to provide it and it could delay the whole planning process.
8.5.2 This type of information does not necessarily need to be outlined within a specific policy, but if it isn’t it should be clearly identified so that applicants know what should be contained in within a planning application. If something is only specific to an allocated site then it would be incorporated into the key development criteria for that site.

8.5.3 Much of the information is similar to what is currently outlined within local requirements of GCC’s validation checklist for minerals development.

8.5.4 The table below highlights the requirements of the validation checklist and indicates whether any additional information is required. Based on new validation checklist which has not yet been adopted (some requirements have not been included as not deemed necessary for this purpose:

NB where the table below refers to See Section 8 guidance this is displayed in Appendix G of the Planning and Environmental Considerations and Draft Policy Framework Evidence Paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Validation Checklist Requirements</th>
<th>Potential Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare/Restoration Scheme</td>
<td>Where the proposed development involves the disturbance of existing agricultural land and particularly when development involves mineral working, landfill or land raising proposals.</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Impact Assessment</td>
<td>When the site is within or adjoining an Air Quality Management Area. Proposals have the potential to impact on air quality.</td>
<td>Contact the Planning Development Management Team for advice as to whether the site falls within this category or to assess whether the proposal may have an adverse impact on air quality. See section 8: Guidance. National Planning Practice Guidance – Air Quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitats Regulations Assessment (Screening Report))</td>
<td>When the application may have significant effects alone or in combination with other plans or projects on any European Site (i.e. Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Site), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) as well as those sites with candidate status).</td>
<td>Where Natural England has confirmed in writing that the development will NOT be likely to have any significant effects alone or in combination with other plans and projects on any European Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdstrike Risk Management Plan</td>
<td>All applications that may have an adverse safety impact on aircraft through the creation of standing water and new woodland within 12 km of aerodromes.</td>
<td>See section 8: Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity (ecological) and/or geodiversity (geological) appraisal (assessment)</td>
<td>When there is a potential for significant impact on biodiversity and/or geodiversity that is adverse or beneficial or both. The appraisal is required to ascertain, through survey and assessment, the effect of the development on designated sites, legally protected species, priority habitats and species on the English List (Section 41 of the Natural Environment &amp; Rural Communities Act 2006) and/or landscape features of importance to biodiversity.</td>
<td>Where Natural England, an appointed ecological advisor or the Planning Authority’s ecologist has confirmed in writing that the development will not be likely to have an impact on biodiversity/geodiversity OR affect any locally, nationally or internationally designated site, a legally protected or priority species, landscape feature of biodiversity importance. • See National Planning Practice Guidance on Natural Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole or Trial Pit Analysis</td>
<td>All applications for the extraction of mineral deposits.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change/sustainability statement</td>
<td>All applications where construction of buildings is to take place.</td>
<td>Where the application does not relate to physical construction or is a renewal of an existing permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Mining Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Development in areas notified by the Coal Authority for which Standing Advice does not apply.</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-section drawing(s)</td>
<td>In all cases where a proposal involves any change in ground levels.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Statement</td>
<td>Where a waste development involves the construction of a new building, a statement setting</td>
<td>See Section 8 guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Draft Planning Obligations also known as Legal Agreement (Section 106) | • Where a proposal that may be unacceptable in planning terms may be made acceptable through the use of planning obligations, a statement with proposed Heads of Terms for an agreement may be submitted as part of the application.  
• Where Local Development Framework or Local Plan policies give details of likely agreements a statement of proposed Heads of Terms may be submitted as part of the application. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dust Assessment</td>
<td>For waste developments with the potential to generate dust and, applications involving major construction works where dust is likely to be an issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Flood Risk Assessment | • Development proposals, including change of use of 1 hectare or greater, in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals, including change of use, for development located in Flood Zone 2 and 3.  
• Where development proposals may affect watercourses, flood defences or off-site flood mitigation.  
• Where the proposed development may be subject to other sources of flooding.  
• Where the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board and/or other bodies have indicated that there may be drainage problems or concerns that need addressing. |
| Foul Sewage and Utilities Assessments | • If the proposed development results in the requirement for a new system or replacement to an existing foul drainage system:  
• Where development requires large amounts of water or indirectly affects water bodies. |
| Heritage and Archaeological Statement | • Where a proposal is likely to affect or impact on a designated heritage asset and/or its setting, or an undesignated heritage asset of equivalent significance and/or its setting.  
• Where other heritage assets e.g. Archaeological sites, historic buildings or structures or historic landscapes are present either on or adjacent to the application site, or where their setting may be affected.  
• Where a site on which development is proposed has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest.  
• Where a proposal involves the disturbance of ground or raising of ground levels where there may be heritage assets, as may be specified in pre-application advice.  
• Where significant infrastructure works are proposed, where there may be heritage assets present, as may be specified in pre-application advice.  
• Applications involving ground disturbance within a Conservation Area.  
• Where a hedge is to be removed or moved or would be affected by the proposal.  
• Where a proposal involves substantial demolition of an existing building. |
| Hydrological Assessment | Where dewatering is proposed or proposals affect the water table. |
| Land contamination assessment | Where there is reason to suspect contamination of the application site or neighbouring land due to previous operations e.g. the existence of former industrial uses, the presence of former landfill sites, and the presence of former mineral tips. |
| Landscape and Visual | Any proposal that due to its scale or location is likely |

Contact the Planning Development Management Team for advice. See section 8: Guidance.

Where the development has a footprint of less than 250m² and is within Zone 1. For further information applicants should contact the Environment Agency. See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk and Coastal Change.

See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on water supply, wastewater and water quality.

See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The heritage team suggested the following general development criteria

Pre-validation/determination: A description of the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their settings, together with an assessment of the impact of the proposals. Where heritage assets with archaeological interest are present, or there is potential for them to be present, a desk-based assessment and a field evaluation will be required.

Post-permission: Mitigation of the loss of the significance of any heritage assets and their settings through preservation and/or an appropriate programme of investigation, recording, publication and archive deposition.

None. See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Land Remediation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Assessment</th>
<th>to have a significant visual impact.</th>
<th>Practice Guidance on Natural Environment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping scheme</td>
<td>Where the proposal contains, or is likely to require, some form of landscaping to make it acceptable in planning terms. Some form of landscaping is expected for most application types.</td>
<td>None. See section 8: Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting scheme (including light pollution assessment)</td>
<td>Where proposals involve the provision of external lighting, or where it will be necessary due to the nature of the development, and where it may have an impact upon the locality. Examples include publicly accessible developments, in the vicinity of residential property, a Listed Building or a Conservation Area, or open countryside.</td>
<td>Where no external lighting is proposed as part of the scheme. See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Light Pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise impact assessment</td>
<td>All land-filling and land raising applications; reworking or reclamation of former landfill sites; recycling of inert waste; where the proposal is likely to generate a noise level above background noise levels which may have a detrimental impact on the nearest noise sensitive property</td>
<td>Further advice should be sought from the Planning Development Management Team on whether this will be required for your development. See section 8: Guidance and NPPG Technical Guidance Note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space/playing field assessment</td>
<td>Where the site is within or adjoining an area of designated or proposed open space/playing fields, common land or village greens. Any application involving the loss or provision of playing fields should be supported by evidence of a district wide Playing Pitch Strategy.</td>
<td>None. See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Open Space, green space and rights of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking provision</td>
<td>All applications involving the provision of parking space for cars and heavy goods vehicles</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing Plans</td>
<td>All applications for mineral extraction and landfill.</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs and/or Photomontages</td>
<td>All applications (apart from some Section 73 applications) should include some photographs or photomontages to enable assessment of characteristics of the site and its setting.</td>
<td>Where the application does not require any form of visual aid to consider its impact – contact the Planning Development Management Team for further advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Plans</td>
<td>Where proposals involve the disturbance of the ground for the extraction of minerals or waste disposal.</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Land Remediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Way route and reference</td>
<td>Where a public right of way traverses or passes close by the application site or involves the temporary diversion or closure of part of a route in order to construct the development.</td>
<td>See section 8 Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Open Space, green space and rights of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Community Engagement</td>
<td>Where the development is expected to have significant effects on the local area such as a large mineral or waste proposal, the developer will need to provide evidence of how communities were involved and issues raised prior to submitting an application as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement.</td>
<td>Contact the Planning Development Management Team for advice. See Section 8: Guidance, Gloucestershire County Council’s Statement of Community Involvement and National Planning Practice Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight / Daylight Assessment Applications</td>
<td>where there is a potential adverse impact upon the current levels of sunlight /daylighting enjoyed by adjoining properties and buildings.</td>
<td>None - contact the Planning Development Management Team for advice. See section 8: Guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Assessment</td>
<td>All applications where there is likely to be a significant impact upon the existing transport network, and/or where additional parking is proposed. Refer to thresholds set out in Dept for Transport guidance on Transport Assessment.</td>
<td>Where there will be no significant increase in the level of transportation involved with the development or that additional parking provision is not being created. Contact the Highways Development Management Team for advice. See section 8: Guidance and Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/2013 - The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development and National Planning Practice Guidance on Travel plans, transport assessment and sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Plan</td>
<td>All applications that have the potential for significant traffic and travel-related implications (refer to the thresholds in the Department for Transport Travel Plan Guidance). Requirement of WCS19.</td>
<td>Where the perceived impacts are not sufficiently significant; contact the Highways Development Management Team for advice. See section 8: Guidance and DfT Circular 02/2013 - The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, NPPG on Travel plans, transport assessment and sustainability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree Survey / Arboricultural</strong></td>
<td>Statement Where there are trees within, on the boundary or in close proximity to the site that could be affected by the proposed development. None. See section 8: Guidance and National Planning Practice Guidance on Tree Preservation Orders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstable Land Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Where the proposal is on or adjoining land which is known or suspected to be unstable through the effects of natural and manmade cavities, unstable slopes and ground compression. See section 8 Guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Where a mineral or waste development is likely to cause deterioration in the ecological status of water bodies such as rivers, lakes or coastal waters. Where this information is included within an Environmental Statement. See Section 8 guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please also refer to Section 10.0 of the Planning and Environmental Considerations and Draft Policy Framework Evidence Paper which provides a more detailed discussion of the policies outlined above.
Section 9: Implementation and Monitoring

Implementation
The policies which appear in the plan will need to be implemented and the plan needs to outline a framework for the implementation. As the policies are only in a consultation form within this document and are subject to change, therefore a completed framework has not been outlined in this consultation. The adopted Waste Core Strategy (WCS) contained a framework and it is proposed that a similar framework will be prepared for all of the final policies. A skeleton framework based upon the WCS framework is shown in the box below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Delivery mechanism/s (i.e. how will the policy be delivered?)</th>
<th>Delivery Agencies</th>
<th>Delivery Funding</th>
<th>Delivery Timescale</th>
<th>Potential constraints to delivery</th>
<th>Mitigation to overcome potential constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring
Each year the authority produces a monitoring report which assesses how well policies are working. This is done by means of a number of indicators which are able to be measured for example by looking at how many planning applications had been permitted or refused in relation to the specific indicator. Again as with the implementation framework a completed framework has not been outlined for this consultation, but a skeleton framework is indicated below that is based upon the one within the WCS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Policy Aims, Objectives and Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant SA objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Relevant Aims, Objectives and Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International and National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy on Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>This policy has a direct correlation with the objective as a reduction in waste will help contribute to Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Minerals Safeguarding Areas</td>
<td>This policy is consistent with the policy insofar as it relates to sustainable husbandry of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Safeguarding Policy for Minerals Infrastructure</td>
<td>This policy has a direct correlation to the priority as it safeguards infrastructure used for handling recyclates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals-Meeting the Need</td>
<td>No direct relationship but the LAA does consider contributions made by alternative aggregates including secondary aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals - Identifying Future Supply Areas</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Preferred Areas for Aggregates</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Proposals for the Working of Aggregates Outside of Preferred Areas</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Policy Aim for Alternative Aggregates</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and objective as both relate to recycled aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Building Stone</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Brick Clay</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Engineering Clay</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Small Scale Coal Underground Mines</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Opencast Coal</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Re-working of Colliery Spoil Tips</td>
<td>No direct relationship but on a broad level it allows for secondary minerals to be produced in preference to primary minerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Flood Risk</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Water Quality</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship between the policy and objective as water quality management has a direct effect upon the environment</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship between the policy and objective as water quality management has a direct effect upon people</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Landscape Policy</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as the landscape is a key environmental asset in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>There is a relationship as Gloucestershire’s landscape has a strong link to the economy through tourism</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed policy for Mineral Working in the Green Belt.</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as the green belt is a key environmental consideration in Gloucestershire</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as the policy</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and objective</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and priority</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for the Historic Environment</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as the heritage is a key environmental consideration</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Sustainable Transport</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Strategic Aim for the Cotswold Water Park.</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship as the environment is a key consideration when discussing landscape—scale changes</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and priority</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Restoration Policy</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship as the environment is a key consideration when discussing restoration of mineral workings</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and priority</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development Management Restoration Policy</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship as the environment is a key consideration when discussing restoration of mineral workings</td>
<td>There is a relationship as one of the policy criteria relates to beneficial afteruses for the community</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and priority</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Mitigation of Environmental Effects</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship between policy and priority</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship between policy and priority</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship between policy and priority in that transport can be a cause of pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Ancillary Development</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship in that the policy relates to facilities for reuse and recycling of inert material</td>
<td>There is a relationship between infrastructure and maintaining supply</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship between infrastructure and resource management</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Safeguarding Aerodromes</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship but there is a relationship between habitats and aerodrome safety</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as between the policy and priority in that people are most at risk from hazards to aerodromes</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as between the policy and priority in that it is the reclamation of mineral sites which needs to be carefully considered in relation to aerodrome safety</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Planning Obligations</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as there gain be significant environmental gains through planning obligations</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship as people can benefit from planning obligations</td>
<td>There is a relationship between the policy and priority as the obligations can relate to long-term afteruse</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a direct correlation between the policy and the priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Borrow Pits</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the environment is a key consideration within the policy</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that minimising disruption to local communities is a key consideration within the policy</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that reclamation is a key consideration within the policy</td>
<td>No direct relationship but borrow pits can help with resource management – usually on a small local scale</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that borrow pits can reduce the need to import minerals from elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Cumulative Impact</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the environment is a key consideration within the policy</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that health, social cohesion and economic potential are key considerations within the policy</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that ecology and visual impacts are policy considerations and reclamation has an influence on these</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that transport is a policy consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Soils</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship between soils and the environment</td>
<td>There is a relationship as safeguarding soils is linked to the economy</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship in that reclamation proposals have a significant impact upon quality of soils</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that PRoW provide accessibility to landscape and other environmental assets</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that people are the main PRoW users</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that reclamation directly impacts upon PRoW</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Policy for Buffer Zones</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the buffer zones protect the environment from any potential adverse impacts</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the buffer zones protect people from any potential adverse impacts</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Policy E15 Protecting the Local Environment – Cotswold Water Park</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the settlement protection zones can help protect the environment from any potential adverse impacts</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that the settlement protection zones can help protect people from any potential adverse impacts</td>
<td>There is a relationship in that water-based reclamation in the UTV has permanently changed the landscape and the settlement protection zones can help maintain a buffer between the settlements and large bodies of water</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
<td>No direct relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Schedule of how the proposed MLP policies replace the 2003 adopted MLP policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 Adopted MLP Policy</th>
<th>Status (Saved or Unsaved under Transitional Arrangements)</th>
<th>Proposed Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 International &amp; European Sites of Nature</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed landscape policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Nationally Important Sites of Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Nationally Important Archaeological Sites (incl. SAMs)</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Other Nationally Important Sites of Historic Interest</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Regionally and Locally Important Designated Sites</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policies for a) biodiversity and geodiversity, b) landscape and c) historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Green Belt</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for green belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 National, Regional and Local Biodiversity</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Protection of the Water Environment</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Flood Risk/Flood Plan Development</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC requested to save policy but SoS chose not to because “This policy is superseded by PPS25”)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13 Riparian Buffer Zones</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for water quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14 Protecting the Local Environment – County Wide</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for buffer zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15 Protecting the Local Environment – Cotswolds Water Park</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>This policy is being consulted upon as to whether it should be taken forward into the new MLP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16 Economic Development</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policies for a) presumption in favour of sustainable development and b) cumulative impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17 Safeguarding Public Access</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for public rights of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18 Opportunities for Improved Access</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through aspects of the proposed policies for a) restoration and b) development management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19 Transport</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for sustainable transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20 Highways</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for sustainable transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21 Safeguarding Railhead and Wharves</td>
<td>Not Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed safeguarding policy for minerals infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 County Contribution to the local apportionment of the Regional Guidelines</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – meeting the need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Landbanks</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – meeting the need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Future Aggregates Mineral Development within Preferred Areas</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through a) proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – identifying future supply areas and b) proposed policy for preferred areas for aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Future Aggregates Mineral Development outside Preferred Areas</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for proposals for the working of aggregates outside of preferred areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Adopted MLP Policy</td>
<td>Status (Saved or Unsaved under Transitional Arrangements)</td>
<td>Proposed Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Areas of Future Crushed Rock Aggregates Mineral Development – Forest of Dean</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through a) proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – identifying future supply areas and b) proposed policy for preferred areas for aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Areas of Future Crushed Rock Aggregates Mineral Development – Cotswold</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through a) proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – identifying future supply areas and b) proposed policy for preferred areas for aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 Areas of Future Sand &amp; Gravel Aggregates minerals Development – Upper Thames Valley</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through a) proposed strategic policy aim for primary aggregate minerals – identifying future supply areas and b) proposed policy for preferred areas for aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE1 Supply of Building Stone</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for building stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE2 Clay</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policies a) for brick clay and b) for engineering clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM1 Opencast Coal Extraction</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for opencast coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM2 Small Scale Underground Mining</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for small scale underground mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM3 Colliery Spoil</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policies for a) opencast coal and b) small scale underground mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM4 Existing Colliery Spoil Tips</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for re-working of colliery spoil tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM5 Reworking Colliery Spoil Tips</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for re-working of colliery spoil tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM6 Oil and Gas</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX1 Mineral Exploration</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1 Processing Secondary Materials</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through Waste Core Strategy core policy WCS4 and the strategic policy aim for alternative aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 Minerals Waste Minimisation</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through Waste Core Strategy core policy WCS4, the strategic policy aim for alternative aggregates, the proposed policy for ancillary development and the proposed development management restoration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 Safeguarding Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for minerals safeguarding areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4 Prior Extraction of Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Not Saved (GCC did not request to save policy)</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for minerals safeguarding areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 Beneficial Reclamation of Worked-Out Mineral Sites</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed restoration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 After-Use</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed development management restoration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Progressive Restoration</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through restoration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Enhancing Worked-Out Mineral Sites</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through policies in the WCS and through the proposed restoration policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC1 Mitigation of Environmental Effects</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for mitigation of environmental effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC2 Ancillary Development</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for ancillary development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Adopted MLP Policy</td>
<td>Status (Saved or Unsaved under Transitional Arrangements)</td>
<td>Proposed Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC3 Importation of Material</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through core policies WCS4 and WCS8 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC4 Safeguarding Aerodromes</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for safeguarding aerodromes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC5 Planning Obligations</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through proposed policy for planning obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC6 Planning Obligations – Eastern Spine Road</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>This policy is no longer relevant but the proposed policy for planning obligations will be appropriate for determining the need for legal agreements related to the Eastern Spine Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC7 Borrow Pits</td>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Through the proposed policy for borrow pits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – List of supporting documents

Evidence Papers to support the Site Options and Draft Policy Framework Consultation
Site Options Evidence Paper
Mineral Safeguarding Evidence Paper
Planning and Environmental Considerations Evidence Paper
Minerals Technical Evidence Paper
Sustainability Appraisal
Habitat Regulations Assessment
Duty to Co-operate
Dialogue with Minerals Industry

Preferred Options Consultation for the Minerals Core Strategy
The main consultation documents from the Preferred Options consultation stage can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107661/2-MCS-Preferred-Options---COMPLETE
These documents include:
- Minerals Preferred Options consultation document
- MCS Preferred Options SA Report
- MCS Preferred Options SA Non Technical Report
- HRA Screening for MCS Preferred Options
- MCS Preferred Options consultation response report

A raft of evidence papers were produced to support the preferred options consultation stage. These can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107668/Evidence-Base-for-the-MLP

The documents include:
- MCS A Sand Gravel Provision and Strategic Locations Report
- MCS B Crushed Rock Provision and Strategic Locations Report
- MCS C Natural Building Roofing Stone Report
- MCS D Secondary Recycled Aggregates Report
- MCS E Spatial Portrait, Vision, Strategic Objectives
- MCS F After Minerals - Restoration Aftercare Afteruse
- MCS G Mineral Resources and Safeguarding
- MCS H Mineral Working in the Green Belt
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 1 Transport
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 2 Links with Districts and Neighbouring Authorities
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 3 Flooding & Hydrological Issues
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 4 Landscape & AONB
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 5 Biodiversity
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 6 Archaeology and the Historic Environment
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 7 Implementation & Monitoring
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 8 Glossary
- Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 9 Proposals Map Joint Technical Evidence Paper WCS-MCS - 10 Climate Change

Issues and Options Consultation for the Minerals Core Strategy
Documents from the Issues and Options consultation stage can be downloaded from http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/article/107650/1-MCS-Issues--Options---COMPLETE
The documents include:
- MCS Issues and Options Part A Summary Version for Public Consultation
- MCS Issues and Options Part A Explanatory Paper
- MCS Issues and Options SA Report
- HRA Screening Report for MCS Issues and Options
- MCS Issues and Options Consultation Response Report
- MCS Issues and Options Full Consultation Representations
- SA Minerals Response Report
Other Relevant GCC Publications
Waste Core Strategy adopted 2012
Minerals Local Plan adopted 2003
First, Second and Baseline Local Aggregates Assessments
Annual/Authorities Monitoring Reports to date
Local Transport Plan 3
Statement of Community Involvement

Government Publications
National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Policy Guidance
National and Regional Guidelines

Other Publications/Influences
South West Aggregates Working Party reports to date
Mineral Extraction and the Historic Environment, published by English Heritage (January 2008),
Mineral Extraction and Archaeology: A Practice Guide, published by the Minerals and Historic Environment Forum
Gloucestershire Nature Map
Cotswolds and Wye Valley AONB Management Plans
Landscape Character Areas
Appendix D – Glossary and Abbreviations

AMM – Abandoned Mine Methane

Aquifers – The special underground rock layers that hold groundwater, which are often an important source of water for public water supply, agriculture and industry.

Authorities Monitoring reports (AMR) (formerly known as Annual Monitoring Reports) – These are reports by local planning authorities assessing progress with, and the effectiveness of plans and policies.

BGS – British Geological Survey

Building Stone – Naturally occurring rock, which is sufficiently consolidated to enable it to be cut or shaped for use as a walling, paving or roofing material

Carboniferous – A major division of geological time. It approximately covers the period between 360 and 280 million years ago

CBM – Coal Bed Methane

CMM – Coal Mine Methane

COG - Conventional Oil and Gas

CWP – Cotswold Water Park

DECC – Department for Energy and Climate Change

Devonian – Is a geological period spanning from roughly 420 to 360 million years ago.

FoD – Forest of Dean

Geodiversity – the variety of forms, processes and materials that the Earth is made up of.

Geographic Information System (GIS) – The system where most of the county’s geographic data is stored.

Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) - Ensures that the protection of the integrity of European sites is considered as part of the planning process. The requirement for HRA of plans or projects is outlined in Article 6(3) and (4) of the European Communities (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (“Habitats Directive”).

Historic Environment Records (HER) - Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.

Jurassic – A major division of geological time. It covers the period between 200 and 130 million years ago

Key Wildlife Site (KWS) – Areas of local nature conservation value designated by the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (see Local Sites).

Landbank – The stock land with planning permissions but where development has yet to take place. Landbanks are commonly used for land, minerals, housing

Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) – an annual assessment of the demand for and supply of aggregates in a minerals planning authority’s area.

Local Site – Local designated sites (which include 'Local Wildlife Sites' and 'Local Geological Sites') make an important contribution to ecological networks and are overseen by Local Sites systems. These systems vary considerably in terms of size (both the administrative area they cover and the number of sites selected) and cover contrasting landscapes in coastal, rural and urban situations. Local Sites systems encompass both biodiversity and geological conservation. In Gloucestershire Local Wildlife Sites are known as Key Wildlife Sites (KWS) and Local Geological Sites are known as Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites (RIGS).

Masonry Stone – Used in construction and is more often bonded with mortar. It can be structural or as a cladding or paving.

MCS – Minerals Core Strategy

MLP – Minerals Local Plan
MPA - Mineral Planning Authority

**National Nature Reserve (NNR)** - Areas of national and some international nature conservation importance, managed primarily to safeguard such interest in accordance with Natural England’s requirements. NNRs are designated under section 19 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 or section 35 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.


**OUGO** – Office of Unconventional Gas and Oil

**Pennant Sandstone** – The term used to cover all sandstone quarried from the Carboniferous period that outcrop in South Wales and the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire

**Preferred Area** – Areas identified in the development plan with a high degree of certainty for potential development / extraction (in the case of minerals)

**RAMSAR** – Wetlands of international importance, designated under the Ramsar Convention.

**Reserves** – Known mineral deposits with the benefit of planning permission for extraction

**Resources** – A potential mineral deposit where the quality and quantity of material has not been fully tested. Resources do not benefit from planning permission

**RIGS** - Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites (see Local Sites).

**RSS** – Regional Spatial Strategy

**Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)** – Sites and remains designated under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological 1979 to ensure protection from development.

**Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)** – A site statutorily protected for its nature conservation, geological or scientific value.

**Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)** – Areas which have been given special protection under the European Union’s Habitats Directive. They provide increased protection to a variety of wild animals, plants and habitats.

**Special Protection Area (SPA)** – Areas which have been identified as being international importance for the breeding, feeding, wintering or the migration of rare and vulnerable species of birds found within European Union countries. They are European designated sites, classified under the ‘Birds Directive 1979’ which provides enhanced protection given by the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) status all SPAs also hold.

**Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)** - The aim of the SFRA is to map all forms of flood risk and use this as an evidence base to locate new development primarily in low flood risk areas (Zone 1). Areas of ‘low’ (zone 1), ‘medium’ (zone 2) and ‘high’ (zone 3) risk.

**Strategic Nature Area (SNA)** - Landscape-scale blocks of land which show opportunities for habitat expansion within the county. They form part of the Gloucestershire Nature Map, which itself forms part of the South West Nature Map.

**Sustainability Appraisal (SA)** – An appraisal of the economic, environmental and social effects of a plan, applied from the outset of the plan preparation process to allow decisions to be made that accord with sustainable development.

**The Environment Agency (EA)** – The Public Body responsible to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs with the principal aims to protect and improve the environment, and to promote sustainable development. They play a central role in delivering the environmental priorities of central government through our functions and roles.

**UGS** – Underground Gas Storage

**UTV** – Upper Thames Valley