Summary of the responses to the Minerals Local Plan Site Options and Draft Policy Framework Consultation (SODPF) 2014

(also including the additional site option consultation 2015)
**Introduction**

This report has been produced as a summary of the comments received to the Site Options and Draft Policy Framework (SODPF) consultation, which took place between June and August 2014. It also includes the comments received to the additional Site Option consultation that was completed between February and March 2015.

The report is laid out to mirror the structure of the original consultation document and accompanying questionnaire. For ease of reference the questions have been numbered throughout the document.
## Section 1 of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1: Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Do you have comments in relation to Section 1: Introduction of the report?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total number of responses to the question | 41 |

### Summary of responses

18 responses were either “no comments” or some general support for either the Introduction or the documents as a whole.

11 responses largely related to objections to the inclusions of certain sites and the issues raised will be considered elsewhere in the document.

Other comments included:
- the use of recycled materials
- the use of hydrocarbons
- comments that the consultation was too technical and too complex for lay audiences to engage with
- whether Duty to Co-operate has been effectively undertaken and that the possibility of importing minerals from elsewhere should be considered
- the responsibility of compensation if things go wrong

### Officer Response

The responses have all been considered and responded to with either individual comments or signposts to the relevant section(s) in this report which address the issues raised.
### Sections 2 of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2: Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.1</strong></td>
<td>Drivers for Change - Do you agree with the drivers for change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you agree with the drivers for change?**

- **No**
- **Yes**
- **Partially**
- **Unsure**

**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2: Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.2</strong></td>
<td>Drivers for change reason - Please outline your reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the responses raised questions such as why certain points had not been included within the drivers for example the impact of Oldbury power station, need for more reuse of recycled materials, mention of floodplain. Others queried where the evidence had originated from and some provided some comments on factual changes.

**Officer Response**

The drivers for change will be reviewed through the preparation of the draft MLP and amended where necessary. All comments raised have been responded to individually through the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report.
Section 2: Spatial Strategy

Question 2.3 Do you agree with the proposed spatial vision?

Total number of responses to the question 36

Summary of responses

Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

Section 2: Spatial Strategy

Question 2.4 Do you agree with the proposed spatial vision? – please outline your reasons

Total number of responses to the question 28

Summary of responses

Some comments were “no comments” or broad level agreement. A large proportion of the comments included a broad disagreement with the vision in general suggesting it was bland, inconsistent, unachievable or too open with sweeping statements. Others made comments that were more related to other aspects of the plan or specific locations within Gloucestershire. A number of respondents raised concerns about minerals transportation and a few made suggestions for changes to the vision.

Officer Response
The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed in the full consultation response report. The comments have been taken into account through the re-writing of the vision for the draft MLP.

Section 2: Spatial Strategy

Question 2.5 Do you agree with the proposed strategic priorities?

Total number of responses to the question SP1=32; SP2=33; SP3=33; SP4=29; SP5=31; SP6=30; SP7=33

Summary of responses
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

Section 2: Spatial Strategy
Question 2.6 Do you agree with the proposed strategic priorities? – please outline your reasons

Total number of responses to the question 20

Summary of responses
There was some broad level support for the priorities/objectives and some "no comments". Some comments queried whether they were in order of priority. A large number commented in relation to transport issues, water resources/flooding and also restoration. Some stated that there were contradictions between the priorities. Others disagreed with the need to make provision for minerals, raised concerns about climate change and provided suggestions for amendments.

Officer Response
The comments have been taken into account through the re-writing and re-naming of the priorities. They are now known as objectives within the draft MLP. It is important to note that the priorities were not hierarchical or laid down in order of preference and this circumstance has not changed. They also represented an overarching direction and are would not be applicable in isolation through the consideration of individual planning proposals. The comments and responses can be viewed in the full consultation response report.

Section 2: Spatial Strategy
Question 2.7 Do you have any other comments in relation to the emerging key diagram?

Total number of responses to the question 15

Summary of responses
Of the 15 responses, 8 were "no comments". The 7 remaining responses included comments that the diagram was vague and made suggestions as to how it could be improved such as adding or removing aspects and placing in a regional context.
**Officer Response**
The comments have been responded to individually and will be taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2: Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.8</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any other comments in relation to the proposed changes to the adopted policies map?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>10 of the 12 responses were “no comments” or uncertainty about what the purpose of the map was. 1 comment raised concerns that it was only going to be available online and the other comment highlighted some constraints which they considered should be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Response</strong></td>
<td>The proposals / policies map will be provided online as so ensure it can be kept up to date and accurate. The intention is to provide some form of version of the proposals / policies map from the publication stage onwards. However, the print map will always be somewhat limited compared to the online version, particularly in terms of the variability in scale of view and the rapidity in which changes can be reflected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2: Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.9</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed policy on presumption in favour of sustainable development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>4 of the responses were “no comments”. 4 responses were broadly supportive. 1 comment referred to out of county resources, the remaining comments largely raised concerns with regards to how the presumption would work in conjunction with other policies in the plan and / or whether it would lead to higher weight being placed upon economic aspects than social or environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Response</strong></td>
<td>All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the more detailed response report. Since the last consultation the Planning Inspectorate has retracted its advice concerning the necessity to include its model policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The model policy is no longer available to review from Planning Inspectorate and Planning Advisory Service (PAS) publications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2: Spatial Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.10</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any other comments in relation to Section 2: Spatial Strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>10 of the responses were “no comments”. Of the three remaining comments 1 was supportive of the plan, strategy and policies, 1 implied confusion as to the purpose of the content and the other response was specific to one of the sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed within the main consultation response report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Mineral Safeguarding

Question 3.1: Do you support the safeguarding options for the various blocks identified below?

Total number of responses to the question:
- Limestone: Op1 = 22; Op2 = 18; Op3 = 18; Op4 = 19
- Sandstone: all options = 14
- Sand & Gravel: Op1 = 16; Op2 = 11; Op3 = 12; Op4 = 12; Op5 = 14
- Clay: Op1 = 11; Op2 = 11; Op3 = 11; Op4 = 12
- Coal: all options = 12

Summary of responses:

1. **Do you support the Limestone Safeguarding Options?**

2. **Do you support the Sandstone Safeguarding Options?**

3. **Do you support the Sand & Gravel Safeguarding Options?**
Section 3: Mineral Safeguarding

Question 3.2 Safeguarding Options - Please outline your reasons

| Total number of responses to the question | 24 |

Summary of responses

As is clear from the responses to the question above there was a mixed level of support and opposition to each of the safeguarding options. Two responses were “no comments”. Several responses supported buffer zones around existing sites and other uses of buffer zones. Some respondents supported safeguarding the entire resource area whilst others felt that it would be too restrictive on other developments or was not necessary. Some respondents appeared to be under the impression that mineral safeguarding was for future mineral development/allocations. Some stated it would be difficult to predict what future mineral importance might be. One respondent felt that there was confusion between what was being safeguarded.

Officer Response

All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The draft MLP presents a policy approach to mineral safeguarding that has taken account of the views expressed by respondents. Entire mineral resource areas are to been safeguarded. However, reasoned and proportionate
exemptions have also been applied to ensure safeguarding will not overly restrict other reasonable and justified development ambitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>3: Mineral Safeguarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.3</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for MSAs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of responses

Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>3: Mineral Safeguarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.4</td>
<td>MSA Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of responses

Some of the responses were broad support/support with reservations or no comments. There were some points raised about the practicalities of implementing the policy including buffer zones and consistency with the district councils. Others re-emphasised points raised elsewhere. Environmental protection was a key issue. Some thought the inclusion of both MSAs and MCAs was confusing.

Officer Response

Firstly, there appears to have been some confusion over the introduction of MSAs. They are allocated area for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources, which might occur with types of non-minerals development. They are not designed to direct or legitimise areas that should be worked for minerals in the future and instead highlight resources that should be safeguarded / protected. Land within a safeguarded area may never be developed for mineral working. In preparing the Draft MLP approach to MSAs the comments received on this matter have all been taken into consideration and can also be viewed through the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>3: Mineral Safeguarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.5</td>
<td>Please outline any comments you have in relation to the proposed standing advice for implementation for MSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of responses

More than half of the comments were broad level support or no comments. There were some suggestions to amendments to wording and one respondent raised concerns about the resource implications of consultations on MSAs.

### Officer Response

The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing mineral safeguarding policies within the Draft MLP.

### Section 3: Mineral Safeguarding

#### Question 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support the proposed safeguarding policy for minerals infrastructure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total number of responses to the question | 14 |

#### Summary of responses

The pie chart shows the distribution of responses to the question. The chart indicates that there is a significant proportion of respondents supporting the proposed safeguarding policy for minerals infrastructure, with a smaller portion expressing different opinions.

### Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

### Section 3: Mineral Safeguarding

#### Question 3.7

Safeguarding Minerals Infrastructure Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 15 |

#### Summary of responses

Some comments were broad support or no comments; others raised concerns that the policy was too restrictive. Some felt wording was too restrictive; others proposed changes included sites which needed to be listed. There were also some statements of facts.

### Officer Response

The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the mineral infrastructure safeguarding policy within the Draft MLP.
### Question 3.8

**Please outline any suggested changes/additions or amendments to Table 1: Infrastructure and facilities proposed to be safeguarded**

| Total number of responses to the question | 10 |

**Summary of responses**

There was some broad level support or no comments. Some factual information had been provided such as observations and also proposed additions or deletions to the site.

**Officer Response**

The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the mineral infrastructure table within the Draft MLP.

---

### Question 3.9

**Do you have any other comments in relation to Section 3 or its supporting evidence base?**

| Total number of responses to the question | 16 |

**Summary of responses**

Several responses were either no comments or were re-emphasising points already raised elsewhere. Some respondent stated having MSAs and MCAs is confusing and felt there should only be one or a better distinction should be made. One comment was in relation to the Cotswold Water Park Boundary, another about liaison between two-tier authorities and another about little recognition of impact to communities.

**Officer Response**

The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the Draft MLP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.1</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals – Meeting the Need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.2</strong></td>
<td>Strategic Policy Aim: Meeting the Need Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the strategic policy aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 of the comments were “no comments”, 3 of the comments were re-emphasising comments made to other questions – mainly related to specific sites. 4 comments were broadly supportive of the policy. 6 disagree with the intention to plan based on historic trends and / or justification for the need. 1 highlighted need to consider productive capacity and the remaining agreed the need should be met, but not at any cost.

Officer Response

Responses to Individual comments have been provided within the main consultation report. They have also been taken into account when preparing the Draft MLP. In terms of the policy aim and its content this has now been incorporated into the overarching strategy and policy framework for aggregate provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.3</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed Strategic Policy Aim for Primary Aggregate Minerals – Identifying Future Supply Areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section 4: Construction Aggregates**

### Question 4.4

Strategic Policy Aim: Identifying Future Supply Areas Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the strategic policy aim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of responses to the question</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of responses**

4 of the responses were “no comments” or “with reservations”. Most of the other respondents raised one or more issue. There were mixed views on potential sand & gravel extraction in the Severn Vale; concerns about whether Duty to Co-operate had been undertaken and that minerals should be imported from elsewhere. Several respondents raised concerns about the LAA supply-lead approach with planning based on historic sales trends, in particular the 70/30 split and why landbanks should be based on 10 years. There was some support for the maintenance of a landbank. Some responses were in specific reference to one or more of the site options and / or planning in the AONB. Other responses provided suggestions for improvements.

**Officer Response**

Responses to Individual comments have been provided within the main consultation report. They have also been taken into account when preparing the Draft MLP. In terms of the policy aim and its content this has now been incorporated into the overarching strategy and policy framework for aggregate provision.

### Question 4.5

Please outline your reasons and any suggested changes to the Supporting Text for Strategic Policy Aim: Identifying Future Supply Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of responses to the question</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of responses**

2 responses were “no comments”, 2 comments made suggestions for improvements to the supporting text such as treating the way sand & gravel is presented the same as how
crushed rock is presented, the remaining comments were re-emphasising specific objections raised in other questions such as sand & gravel should come primarily from the UTV.

**Officer Response**

Responses to Individual comments have been provided within the main consultation report. They have also been taken into account when preparing the Draft MLP. National policy dictates the overarching approach to how to make provision for construction aggregates and this has been interpreted locally through the consideration of the county’s resources areas, supply and demand trends, and activity from within influencing neighbouring mineral resource areas. For clarification the resource ‘blocks’ as described in the emerging plan, represent broad areas reflective of the underlying geology and are not simply sub-divisions of local areas related to other well established boundaries such as those used for administrative districts. The resource blocks contain minerals of specific characteristics (and of a sufficient quantity), which are prevalent in that area and this has been the determining factor in why blocks have been identified in the plan.

**Section 4: Construction Aggregates**

**Question 4.6**

Do you support the proposed policy for Preferred Areas for Aggregates?

| Total number of responses to the question | 28 |

Summary of responses

**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

**Section 4: Construction Aggregates**

**Question 4.7**

Preferred Areas for Aggregates Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 19 |

Summary of responses

There were several points raised in relation to this question. Some were “no comments/observations”. The other comments included: that the question was too broad and difficult to answer without knowing what the sites would be; there is
prematurity because we should be importing minerals instead and therefore haven’t undertaken Duty to Co-operate properly; reiteration of objections raised on other questions such as to specific sites; disagree with 70/30 split; disagree with government imposed policy approach; landbank is only minimum requirement and we should plan for productive capacity; need more reinforcement of key issues affecting choices.

Officer Response
All comments raised have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.8</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the allocation of any of the following sites within the forthcoming MLP for crushed rock in the Forest of Dean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>Overall 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFD1A</td>
<td>CRFD1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of responses**

*Do you support the allocation of CRFD1A*

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Unsure

*Do you support the allocation of CRFD1B*

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Unsure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CRFD1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CRFD2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CRFD3A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CRFD4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer Response

All comments raised have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.9</td>
<td>Crushed Rock Forest of Dean Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy – also includes consideration of the additional option consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses to the question 222
(Addition option 22)

Summary of responses

Out of the responses to these sites there were:
- comments applicable to more than one site;
- comments specific to one site;
- unique comments

Many of the respondents raised the same or similar issues and these cover the first two bullets which have been summarised below. Any unique comments have been responded to individually and can be referred to in the main consultation response report.

Taking these bullets in turn:

**Comments applicable to more than one site**
1. The site is within or adjacent to the AONB
2. Other general landscape, visual impact or screening concerns
3. Impact on the economy including tourism
4. High quality agricultural land
5. The site is clearly unsuitable why has it been consulted upon?
6. Impact upon a Public Right of Way (PRoW)
7. Loss of view or devaluation of property
8. General concerns relating to proximity to sensitive receptors (including residents, historic assets, ecology and hydrology)
9. Concerns related to specific historic assets
10. Not undertaking Duty to Co-operate
11. Minerals could be imported from elsewhere/ failure on this aspect of Duty to Co-operate
12. There is no proven need for the stone / stone is not required.
13. General concerns regarding highways/access/infrastructure (see also CRFD4A Hewelsfield below).
14. Concerns about intensification of quarrying operations
15. Lack of confidence in enforcement
16. Site is uneconomic
17. Don’t agree with the 70/30 split
18. Presumption that allocated sites would automatically be granted permission
19. Minerals should be worked in less constrained areas/ areas closer to the urban areas where the stone is required or closer to the motorway network.
20. The sites could end up as landfills
21. A Habitats Regulations Assessment would be required
22. Potential conflicts between aspects of plan such as vision, priorities and policies
23. Should be a better use of recycled materials
24. The site is greenfield
25. Too much land is allocated
26. Concerns about silica dust

Comments specific to one site

CRFD2A Drybrook
27. Lorry movements and new road configuration
28. Concerns about the gas pipeline

CRFD4A Hewelsfield
29. There is inadequate road access to the site/local roads unsuitable for lorry movements.
30. Unlikely to be deliverable or contribute to landbank during plan period.

Officer Response

Comments applicable to more than one site: -

1. The NPPF states that as far as practicable landbanks should be maintained from outside certain designation areas including AONBs. In Gloucestershire almost all of the Jurassic limestone and a significant proportion of the Carboniferous limestone are within an AONB. Indeed 87% of the remaining crushed rock reserves in Gloucestershire are within the AONBs. Alternative supply options (including outside of the county) were considered through the 2008 Preferred Options consultation and has continued to be explored through more recent “Duty to Co-operate” meetings with relevant neighbouring authorities. Presently, supply and demand trends and knowledge of reserves (inside and outside of the county) means that excluding future provision options from within the county’s AONB designations will not represent a practicable and / or viable solution when considered in the context of needing to ensure steady and adequately supplies of aggregate can be maintained for Gloucestershire throughout the plan period. Nevertheless, the presence of AONB designations has played a crucial role in determining, which sites should be taken forward into the plan.

2. All sites going forward into the Draft MLP have been subject to additional landscape assessments by a commissioned, qualified landscape architect. The results of these assessments have been considered in the preparation of the Draft MLP.

3. There is a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development within current national policy and economic development is a core aspect of this. Minerals contribute to economic development not only by generating employment related to the extraction and supply of minerals, but also by facilitating economic development. Housing and other development cannot take place without construction minerals. The positive economic aspects of mineral development need to be carefully balanced against any potential detrimental impacts and the appropriate stage to make this assessment is at planning application stage when all of the specifics of any proposals are known such as plant location, proposed outputs, proposed lorry routes etc. Furthermore, all mineral development is
temporary in nature with an end date conditioned through the planning permission; in many instances can have a positive impact upon the local environment, tourism and the community through the final restoration proposal.

4. With regards to mineral development, the NPPF states that 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). This has been transposed into the MLP through the proposed policy for soils and also the proposed restoration policies. Clearly it is preferable that the highest quality agricultural land is preserved for agriculture, however as minerals are not equally dispersed throughout the county; there may be a need to work some better quality agricultural land. In the first instance the Council will take into account as far as practicable the use of land of poorer quality over higher quality in the allocation of sites. However, this will need to be balanced against other issues relating to the allocation of suitable sites. In these instances where best and most versatile agricultural land is present the operator would need to clearly demonstrate through the planning application process that the development cannot be met on poorer quality land as well as satisfying the other policy requirements. This may also include a more detailed soil assessment as some of the nationally available datasets relating to soil are not specific enough.

5. The County Council made a decision to present all sites submitted to them by industry and landowners as options at this stage. This was to ensure that all stakeholders were made fully aware of all of the issues and facts surrounding the sites and were able to have an opportunity to make a representation to the Council. Had the Council not included some of the sites in the process without allowing a full public consultation on them, the promoter of the site would have still been able to request for the Inspector to consider the site through the examination process as an “omission site” and the Inspector would not then have the benefit of the public’s and other stakeholders’ input. In that way if any of these sites are considered at the examination as an omission site the Inspector will benefit from stakeholder input including anything from District Councils, Parishes and other statutory consultees.

6. Any changes or impacts to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) must be in accordance with the law. Gloucestershire County Council is statutorily responsible for maintaining the Definitive PRoW map for Gloucestershire and the PRoW team have been involved with inputting into the Site Options Evidence Paper. Should a planning application come forward which affects the PRoW this would need to be dealt with through the official methods as well as complying with the proposed policy covering Public Rights of Way matters. This will include whether satisfactory arrangements for the diversion of the PRoW can be found. In some instances mineral restoration can even result in enhancement of existing PRoWs.

7. Unfortunately the minerals planning authority is only able to take into account “material considerations”, for which a loss of view or negative effect on property values does not feature. For further information please see http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/faq/faqapplyprocess.
8. With regards to proximity to sensitive receptors. The site options identified through the consultation are being considered with regards to their potential to support mineral extraction in the future. In preparing the new minerals plan, the supporting evidence must be up-to-date, relevant and also proportionate. In the context of identifying potential sites for inclusion in the plan, this means the focus is upon: - broad level environmental constraints; the prospects of being able to realistically achieve acceptable levels of mitigation and the realisation of any positive opportunities. Specific elements of a minerals development such as site accessibility, plant location, extraction faces, landscaping buffering and / or soil storage bunds etc… are presently unknown and will not normally be brought forward until a planning application is submitted. Consequently, in the absence of key development particulars, the MPA are unable to pass judgement as to whether receptors in isolation or cumulatively would be adversely impacted to an irresolvable extent that no mineral extraction should be allowed. This is in respect to dust; particle emissions; blasting vibrations, where relevant; and / or noise levels at noise sensitive properties and other receptors. In the event that a detailed planning proposal is submitted, specialist technical input will be utilised and a proposal will only be allowed if it can be clearly demonstrated that a satisfactory mitigation package will be put in place. This would also apply to whether a HIA is required and if deemed necessary the planning application stage would be the most appropriate time.

9. As mineral working can permanently destroy archaeological remains, archaeology and the settings of designated heritage assets are an important consideration in the formation of the plan. All of the sites have been assessed by a qualified archaeologist as well as being considered by English Heritage and the results of this were presented in the Site Options Evidence Paper. Furthermore, in addition to national planning policy framework and guidance, there is a proposed plan policy for the Historic Environment as well as proposed Development Management Criteria for the Historic Environment which any forthcoming planning application for minerals would need to accord with. With regards to the setting of heritage assets, it should be noted that minerals developments are effectively temporary in nature and any landscape and restoration schemes would need to be sympathetic when set against assets of historical significance or importance. English Heritage as well as the County Heritage team is also involved with all planning applications and any schemes would need to satisfy the requirements of these qualified consultees.

10. The County Council, alongside all other local authorities in England and some public bodies are duty bound to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis, to maximise the effectiveness of their local plan preparation in the context of responding to strategic cross boundary matters. This duty is known as the ‘Duty to Co-operate’. From a minerals planning perspective, the provision of minerals is recognised as potential strategic matter likely to necessitate engagement. The County Council has published an evidence papers and an update progress report to document its present duty to co-operate activities to date. The main paper includes a broad discussion regarding the relationship between Gloucestershire and other neighbouring, and more distant local authorities in terms of identifiable and established supply chains, trends in the
movement of minerals, and the likelihood that such circumstances will have a demonstrable influence upon the preparation of the emerging minerals local plan. It is clear that the import to and export of minerals from Gloucestershire will probably have some role to play in maintaining steady and adequate supplies in the future. However, the County Council is not party to any evidence to suggest this will be significant enough to justify a deviation from the present approach of assessing the acceptability of future local mineral working to meet (if only in part) local needs. This is particularly pertinent in the context of the emerging plan’s aspiration to facilitate the management of local mineral resources in a sustainable manner as is possible, which incorporates seeking to reduce vehicle movements related to the supply of minerals and the associated vehicle emissions.

11. The County Council has been engaging with other local authorities throughout the MLP process through the Duty to Co-operate. The discussions were documented in the Duty to Co-operate evidence paper and such issues were raised. However, the most sustainable option is to explore whether it can meet local demand from sites within Gloucestershire before looking to import alternatives from elsewhere which in itself could lead to increased unsustainable road movements.

12. The quantities of aggregates required in Gloucestershire is addressed through the Local Aggregates Assessment and reviewed annually. Whilst a proportion of mineral is exported out of the county, it should also be recognised that the county does also import aggregates and other minerals. Not every county or unitary authority within the country contains sufficient geological diversity to meet their requirements and therefore has to rely on other authorities to provide minerals to them. The emerging provision coming from the LAA is consistent with Government policy and considered an appropriate basis for the preparation of the MLP.

13. Prior to the granting of planning permissions many sites have unsuitable access or infrastructure in place. This is something which needs to be established through the planning application process in discussion with the Highways Authority and where relevant improvements to the existing road network may be required.

14. The purpose of allocating the sites within the plan would be to allow a continuation of supply by maintaining current productive capacity over a longer period of time. It would not be intended to increase the overall output or intensifying operations on site. Any allocation within the plan cannot be worked until a new planning permission is obtained. Permission would not be issued unless the operator could satisfactorily demonstrate that any issues could be successfully mitigated.

15. Enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant
planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Breaches of other regulatory requirements outside of the County Council’s jurisdiction are a matter for other relevant authorities or appropriate agencies. For example, environmental pollution matters are likely to be dealt with by the Environment Agency.

16. The decision to pursue the establishment of new mineral workings and, or to re-establish previously extraction operations will ultimately lie with the controlling mineral operator. The value of extracted mineral against the upfront and ongoing costs associated with quarry operations, which will need to incorporate putting in place sufficient safeguards and protections as deemed necessary through regulatory regimes, such as planning, are the most probably viability matters of consideration. For the purposes of preparing the new emerging Minerals Local Plan and identifying sites where mineral working may be achievable in the future, the MPA will need to be sufficiently satisfied that the potential for mineral working at a given site exists. This is usually achievable through an assessment of demonstrable evidence of the presence of available resources; and the likelihood that any protections and, or mitigation measures, which will probably be needed, are also practicably achievable.

17. The Draft Minerals Local Plan minerals technical evidence paper explain how the County Council has reviewed the 70/30 and still consider it appropriate for current forward planning purposes and why the two different resource areas are not necessarily suitable to substitute for each other.

18. With regards to presumption that quarrying will be granted. Any site allocated in the plan would not automatically be granted permission. A permission would only be issued subject to the applicant be able to demonstrate that any potentially harmful effects could be successfully mitigated.

19. In Gloucestershire the limestone used for crushed rock is not present within the larger urban areas; therefore it is only possible to work in the locations where it is located (e.g. the Forest of Dean and the Cotswolds).

20. Gloucestershire adopted its Waste Core Strategy in November 2012, which sets out most of the policy requirements for waste management in Gloucestershire up until 2026. This is in accordance with current Government and European policy whereby landfill is the least desired approach for both mixed household and/or commercial and industrial waste which includes biodegradable wastes. Furthermore landfill of biodegradable wastes is unlikely to be permitted in areas which are underlain by unsuitable porous such as limestone or other aquifer-bearing rocks. There may be instances whereby inert waste materials such as soils could be imported to assist with minerals restoration. Where this is the case, the proposal would need to take account of WCS Policy 8 and any potential impacts such as dust would need to be satisfied through the planning application process and potential emissions would need to be assessed by a suitably qualified expert in accordance with national policy.

21. Whether a Habitats Regulation Assessment would be required at the planning application is not a valid reason for including or excluding a site from the plan.
Any new minerals development in relation to sites where there could be a likely significant effect upon a European site should be subject to HRA screening by the developer before submitting a planning application and then by the MPA once such an application had been received. The Draft MLP Policy DM06 Biodiversity & Geodiversity alongside any relevant Site Schedule (Profile) will ensure that this happens.

22. The plan is intended to be viewed as a whole and the vision, strategic priorities and policies are not intended to be viewed in isolation. The policies are in place to facilitate delivery of the overall vision and strategic priorities over the timeframe of the plan. There are circumstances they may arise from time to time were a balance must be struck should a potential conflict present between different ambitions contained within the plan.

23. Whilst it is acknowledged that once minerals are used they can never be replaced, consideration must be given to their unavoidable use to keep pace with demand and the realistic and viable availability of more sustainable alternative materials. The use of secondary and recycled aggregates is promoted through the plan, but at present there is only a limited quantity of suitable material available to recycle. This means that some mineral extraction is still required to satisfy Gloucestershire’s mineral needs. The plan sets out to husband the mineral resource in accordance with current Government guidelines through policies which allocate preferred areas of minerals, safeguard mineral resources and seek to minimise quarry waste. Draft MLP policy SR01 seeks to maximise the use of secondary and recycled aggregates.

24. It is noted that the sites are greenfield. However, this is simply a circumstance of where the mineral is present and not a conscious strategic policy decision. Prior extraction may offer an opportunity to enable mineral working on a brownfield site, although the determining factor is presence of mineral not that is contains a former land use.

25. The consultation document was considering a range of options it was clear that not all options would be required.

26. The silica content of limestone is generally very low – please see the HSE publication Control of Exposure to Silica Dust available from [http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg463.pdf](http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg463.pdf). Issues related to dust would be more appropriate to be considered at planning application stage when more specific details are known (see above).

**Comments specific to one site**

**CRFD2A Drybrook**

27. At the time of the Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation the application was still undetermined and highways concerns were being considered. This has subsequently been approved and the officer’s report estimates the quarry would be worked at an approximate rate of 250,000 tonnes per annum. The original 2003 MLP allocation for the site states that if no suitable alternative access could be found then output should be restricted to at or near
existing levels. The recent consultation document suggests this would be a maximum of 350,000 tpa. The 2003 MLP proposed that unless a more suitable access could be identified the extension should be worked through the existing access at existing output levels. The site was recently permitted a time extension and many of the traffic issues were addressed through the recent application. Notwithstanding this any extension would need a new permission and a transport assessment would be required. This would also consider whether any highways obligations would be needed in order to make any extension acceptable on transport grounds.

28. The issues surrounding the gas pipeline would be most appropriate to explore at planning application stage where the onus would be on the developer to demonstrate that they could satisfactorily mitigate any problems.

**CRFD4A Hewelsfield**

29. It is acknowledged that there are some serious highways constraints to overcome in order to make this site acceptable.

30. It is acknowledged that there are deliverability issues surrounding the site and, even if an operator declared an interest in the site, it would be unlikely to make much, if any, contribution to the landbank during the plan period.

**CRFD1A Stowe Hill/Clearwell & CRFD1B Stowe Hill/Clearwell**
The operator has submitted a planning application for most of Parcel A and all of Parcel B. It is therefore considered that the site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures. The two parcels originally considered should be merged into a single parcel. However, the small residual area of parcel A which did not form part of the recent planning application should be removed as it clearly does not have operator interest and would be undeliverable given that (if successful) the current application would last beyond the plan period.

**CRFD1C Stowe Hill/Clearwell**
The MPA is proposing not to take forward Area C as an extension of working at Stowe Hill / Clearwell Quarry within the timeframe of the emerging Minerals Local Plan. This is as a consequence of deliverability issues, which are specifically attributable to information provided by the present proximal mineral operator at Stowe Hill / Clearwell Quarry. It is the understanding of the MPA that the operator does not wish to pursue an interest in extraction at Area C at this time.

**CRFD2A Drybrook**
The MPA is proposing to include a modified boundary in draft MLP as a Preferred Area but only for an extension to the existing Drybrook Quarry. The site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures. However, one parcel of the land should be removed because it does not have landowner interest and would never form part of a future planning application.
**CRFD3A Stowfield**
The MPA is proposing not to include the site in the draft MLP. It is considered that there are archaeological constraints on the site which cannot be overcome.

**CRFD3C Stowfield**
The MPA is proposing to include the site in the Draft MLP as a Preferred Area but only to form a deepening of the existing Stowfield Quarry utilising existing access and infrastructure. The site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures.

**CRFD4A Hewelsfield**
The MPA is proposing not to take forward Area A of CRFD4. Facilitating a new standalone mineral development within the timeframe of the emerging Minerals Local Plan without demonstrable justification, would be wholly inconsistent with national minerals policy. Furthermore, the MPA’s conclusion is strengthened as a consequence of the site being located within the designated Wye Valley AONB and the fact there is a realistic prospect that acceptable aggregate mineral supplies can be achieved through facilitating extraction at existing and potentially extended sites, which lie outside of the AONB designation and/or existing or potentially extended AONB operations, which are likely to be realisable without causing more harm.

### Section 4: Construction Aggregates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.10</th>
<th>Do you support the allocation of any of the following sites within the forthcoming MLP for Crushed Rock in the Cotswolds?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>CRCW1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of responses

**Do you support any of the sites for Crushed Rock in the Cotswolds?**

- **Unsure**
- **Partially**
- **No**
- **Yes**

**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.
**Section 4: Construction Aggregates**

**Question 4.11** Crushed Rock Cotswolds Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 33 |

**Summary of responses**

Out of the responses to these sites there were:
- comments applicable to more than one site;
- comments specific to one site;
- unique comments

Many of the respondents raised the same or similar issues and these cover the first two bullets which have been summarised below. Any unique comments have been responded to individually and can be referred to in the main consultation response report.

Taking these bullets in turn:

**Comments applicable to more than one site**

1. The sites are located within the Cotswolds AONB
2. The site does not have any suitable infrastructure and/or access in place/safety concerns on highways.
3. General ProW concerns
4. Proximity to sensitive receptors (including residents, historic assets, ecology and hydrology)
5. Allocations could lead to an increase in output or intensification of operations
6. Dust
7. General landscaping concerns
8. Potentially conflicts between site allocations and strategic priorities and/or vision
9. Vision implies local provision and material being transported further than local
10. Buffer zones
11. Confusion over how sites have been considered as options

**Comments specific to one site**

**CRCW1A Daglingworth Quarry**

12. Public right of way between the existing Daglingworth Quarry and Area A.

**CRCW3A – Three Gates Quarry**

13. The site is currently inactive
14. The potentially small yield does not outweigh the disruption
15. Potential impact on local businesses including the pub
16. History of planning contraventions at the site.

**Officer Response**

**Comments applicable to more than one site**

1. With regards to the location within the AONB. This issue was considered within paragraph 4.2.3 of the consultation document. The NPPF states that as far as practicable landbanks should be maintained from outside certain designated areas including AONBs. In Gloucestershire almost all of the Jurassic limestone
and a significant proportion of the Carboniferous limestone are within an AONB. Indeed 87% of the remaining crushed rock reserves in Gloucestershire are within the AONBs. Alternative supply options (including outside of the county) were considered through the 2008 Preferred Options consultation and has been further explored through more recent “Duty to Co-operate” meetings with relevant neighbouring authorities, but without the support from or ability of these authorities to plan for Gloucestershire’s requirements it cannot be relied upon and therefore Gloucestershire must plan for its own needs. The strategy suggests that it is appropriate and sustainable to make provision in the Cotswold Resource area. If around 30% of provision in Gloucestershire should come from Jurassic limestone it will probably have to come from the AONB as there are no other options. It is unlikely that any other planned provision could be made from sources outside the AONB to meet this share of the 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.

2. With regards to highways or infrastructure concerns: Prior to the granting of planning permissions many sites have unsuitable access or infrastructure in place. This is something which needs to be established through the planning application process in discussion with the Highways Authority and where relevant improvements to the existing road network may be required.

3. Any changes or impacts a Public Rights of Way (PRoW) must be in accordance with the law. Gloucestershire County Council is statutorily responsible for maintaining the Definitive PRoW map for Gloucestershire and the PRoW team have been involved with inputting into the Site Options Evidence Paper. Should a planning application come forward which affects the PRoW this would need to be dealt with through the official methods as well as complying with the Proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way. This will include whether satisfactory arrangements for the diversion of the PRoW can be found. In some instances mineral restoration can even result in enhancement of the existing PRoW.

4. With regards to proximity to sensitive receptors. The site options identified through the consultation are being considered with regards to their potential to support mineral extraction in the future. In preparing the new minerals plan, the supporting evidence must be up-to-date, relevant and also proportionate. In the context of identifying potential sites for inclusion in the plan, this means the focus is upon: - broad level environmental constraints; the prospects of being able to realistically achieve acceptable levels of mitigation and the realisation of any positive opportunities. Specific elements of a minerals development such as site accessibility, plant location, extraction faces, landscaping buffering and / or soil storage bunds etc... are presently unknown and will not normally be brought forward until a planning application is submitted. Consequently, in the absence of key development particulars, the MPA are unable to pass judgement as to whether receptors in isolation or cumulatively would be adversely impacted to an irresolvable extent that no mineral extraction should be allowed. This is in respect to dust; particle emissions; blasting vibrations, where relevant; and / or noise levels at noise sensitive properties and other receptors. In the event that a detailed planning proposal is submitted, specialist technical input will be utilised.
and a proposal will only be allowed if it can be clearly demonstrated that a satisfactory mitigation package will be put in place.

5. The consultation document did not propose to increase the output at any of the site options. The purpose of allocating sites in the plan is to allow continuation of supply at existing productive capacity levels not an increase.

6. With regards to dust, the plan is a looking at a site for broad acceptability of mineral extraction and the specifics such as vehicle access, plant location, extraction areas, landscaping buffers or soil storage bunds will not be known at this stage. These and other relevant factors can affect whether there would be any impacts from dust which would need to be mitigated. Current planning practice guidance states that “mineral operators are expected to prepare a dust assessment study, which should be undertaken by a competent person/organisation with acknowledged experience of undertaking this type of work”. As such it is felt appropriate that dust issues are considered at planning application stage when all relevant factors are known. Any applications would only be successful if it could be clearly demonstrated that the effects could be mitigated through appropriate planning conditions.

7. All sites going forward into the draft MLP have had additional landscape assessments undertaken on them and any issues raised will be considered through that process.

8. In relation to possible conflicts between site allocations and the Vision and / or spatial priorities, the vision and priorities are intended to apply across the plan as a whole and where potential conflicts could occur a balance needs to be struck. The plan contains a complete suite of policies which ensure that any potential planning application would need to satisfy a wide range of issues and through mitigation would ensure that any possible conflicts are minimised.

9. The vision does not suggest that minerals should be limited to solely local provision. Given that minerals are diverse and not evenly spread across the country it is inevitable that some minerals will travel further afield as well as meeting some local requirements. If no mineral provision was identified the minerals would need to be imported from elsewhere which would mean additional HGV movements into the county. In addition to the total reserves, consideration also needs to be made to maintaining productive capacity. It is explained in paragraph 2.2.14 of the Minerals Technical Evidence that after 2027 productive capacity could not be met in the Cotswolds even if there were sufficient permitted reserves.

10. There is no set minimum distance for a buffer zone as it can vary greatly according to size and nature of operation and local characteristics. Again it is more appropriate to consider at planning application stage when the full details of the proposal are known.

11. The recent consultation was for possible site options and was not a draft MLP. The County Council made a decision to present all sites submitted to them by industry and landowners as options at this stage. This was to ensure that all
stakeholders were made fully aware of all of the issues and facts surrounding the sites and were able to have an opportunity to make a representation to the Council. Had the Council not included some of the sites in the process without allowing a full public consultation on them, the promoter of the site would have still been able to request for the Inspector to consider the site through the examination process as an “omission site” and the Inspector would not then have the benefit of the public’s and other stakeholders’ input. In that way if any of these sites are considered at the examination as an omission site the Inspector will benefit from stakeholder input including anything from District Councils, Parishes and other statutory consultees. It is not proposed to allocate preferred areas for building stone production. The reasons for this were outlined in paragraph 5.2.3 of the consultation document.

Comments specific to one site

CRCW1A Daglingworth Quarry

12. With regards to the public right of way between the existing Daglingworth Quarry and Area A, the adopted 2003 MLP acknowledged the presence of the PRoW and highlighted that it should be retained. It recommended minerals should be transported to the existing quarry via a tunnel. These recommendations are to be carried forward into the draft MLP.

CRCW3A – Three Gates Quarry

13. Although the site is currently inactive, it does have a valid planning permission for building stone extraction to last until 2033 and could commence operations at any time during the remaining life of its permission subject to satisfying pre-commencement conditions which include improvements to the access. Any potential extension would require a separate planning permission and this would be the same for any current active quarry or indeed a brand new quarry.

14. With regards to the potential yield being too small, the decision to pursue the establishment of new mineral workings and, or to re-establish previously extraction operations will ultimately lie with the controlling mineral operator. The value of extracted mineral against the upfront and ongoing costs associated with quarry operations, which will need to incorporate putting in place sufficient safeguards and protections as deemed necessary through regulatory regimes, such as planning, are the most probably viability matters of consideration. For the purposes of preparing the new emerging Minerals Local Plan and identifying sites where mineral working may be achievable in the future, the MPA will need to be sufficiently satisfied that the potential for mineral working at a given site exists. This is usually achievable through an assessment of demonstrable evidence of the presence of available resources; and the likelihood that any protections and, or mitigation measures, which will probably be needed, are also practically achievable.

15. With regards to the potential impact on local businesses including the pub, there is a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development within current national policy and economic development is a core aspect of this. Minerals contribute to economic development not only by generating employment related to the extraction and supply of minerals, but also by facilitating economic development. Housing and other development cannot take place without
construction minerals. The positive economic aspects of mineral development need to be carefully balanced against any potential detrimental impacts and the appropriate stage to make this assessment is at planning application stage when all of the specifics of any proposals are known such as plant location, proposed outputs, proposed lorry routes etc. Furthermore all mineral development is temporary in nature with an end date conditioned through the planning permission; in many instances the final restoration proposals can have a positive impact upon tourism.

16. With regards to concerns about planning contraventions, firstly it should be noted that Three Gates Quarry is a separate quarry owned by a different operator to Cotswold Hill Quarry. Secondly, every planning application is judged on its own merits and there are generally conditions attached to any successful planning permission to ensure that any potential concerns or issues are mitigated. In the event a planning breach is identified there are enforcement procedures in place with the legal powers to ensure that the problems are rectified.

Consultation Outcome
CRCW1A – Daglingworth Quarry
The site has been taken forward into the draft MLP. The reason is that the circumstances have not changed since the allocation of this site in the previous 2003 adopted MLP. The site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures.

CRCW2A – Huntsmans Quarry
The site was originally allocated in the 2003 MLP as an extension to the Huntsmans Quarry which is already supplying aggregate minerals under exceptional circumstances in the AONB. Whilst there is both mineral operator interest and landowner interest for the entire parcel A, the site is not the mineral operator’s first choice for a future extension to Huntsmans Quarry. A significant part of the Area A is covered by the existing operation at Tinkers Barn is currently restricted to supplying non-aggregate minerals and a change in this circumstance at this locality through the provision of extended, intensified aggregate working, risks inconsistency with national minerals policy. The operations with aggregate permission in the AONB have been assessed and deemed acceptable in planning terms for this purpose. It is also likely that less harmful aggregate extraction can be secured by way of extensions to these operations for the purpose of maintaining adequate supplies into the future, where this is deemed necessary. At this time no evidence has been presented to the MPA to justify a change in current aggregate supply restrictions. There is a small parcel of land adjacent to land under the control of Tinkers Barn and land belonging to Breedon Aggregates. It does not have either operator or landowner interest and is therefore considered undeliverable during the plan period.

It is proposed to take forward only the small area under the ownership of Breedon Aggregates and not the larger area covered by the Tinkers Barn permission or the small parcel of land adjacent to these two area.

Although the site is not the operator’s first choice, the geology of the surrounding area
does vary considerably and the site offers a small potential viable alternative if the other preferred area (Area C discussed below) is found to contain less resources than previously anticipated due to the geological fault contained within it. Furthermore inclusion provides a higher degree of operator certainty (and thus potential investment) for managing the resource block in this locality. This should facilitate greater opportunities to achieve a fully comprehensive restoration of the site.

**CRCW2B – Huntsmans Quarry**
There is no mineral operator or landowner interest in this site and it is not therefore considered deliverable during the plan period, nor is it considered necessary given that other parcels of land are more favourable as extensions to Huntsmans Quarry.

**CRCW2C – Huntsmans Quarry**
The site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period – a scoping opinion has already been issued for the site. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures.

**CRCW3A – Three Gates Quarry and CRCW4A Oathill Quarry**
Notwithstanding the above, the MPA is proposing not to take forward either CRCW3 or CRCW4 as potential aggregate extensions to Three Gates and Oathill Quarries within the timeframe of the emerging Minerals Local Plan. The existing Oathill operation is primarily supplying non-aggregate minerals – mostly building stone, and Three Gates Quarry, although presently inactive, is only permitted to supply non-aggregate minerals – mostly for building stone purposes with an extant permission containing a restriction upon on-site crushing. A change in these circumstances at these localities through the provision of extended, intensified aggregate working, risks inconsistency with national minerals policy. The proposed areas fall wholly within the Cotswold AONB, which itself is already facilitating a supply of aggregate minerals from extant operations under exceptional circumstances. These operations have been assessed and deemed acceptable in planning terms for this purpose. It is also likely that less harmful aggregate extraction can be secured by way of extensions to these operations for the purpose of maintaining adequate supplies into the future, where this is deemed necessary. The MPA acknowledge some aggregate extraction has occurred within the existing Oathill quarry in the past and this may be carried out in the future. It is seen as an unavoidable consequence of facilitating building stone extraction that can be advantageous in achieving efficient working. This practice is presently restricted under extant conditions. At this time no evidence has been presented to the MPA to justify a change in current low-level aggregate supply restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.12</td>
<td>Do you support the allocations of any of the following sites within the MLP for sand &amp; gravel extraction in the UTV?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

Section 4: Construction Aggregates

Question 4.13 Sand & Gravel UTV Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 33

Summary of responses

Out of the responses to these sites there were:

- comments applicable to more than one site;
- unique comments

Many of the respondents raised the same or similar issues and these cover the first bullet and which have been summarised below. Any unique comments have been responded to individually and can be referred to in the main consultation response report.

Comments applicable to more than one site

1. General concerns relating to proximity to sensitive receptors (including residents, historic assets, ecology and hydrology)
2. Specific concerns regarding impact upon historic assets
3. Specific concerns regarding hydrological impacts
4. Concerns with regards to compliance and enforcement
5. Concerns about increase in quarrying activity or intensification of operations
6. Concerns about impacts to public rights of way.
7. Unsuitable access/infrastructure in place
8. Concerns about birdstrike risk and the involvement of the MoD
9. Concerns about high quality agricultural land
10. Concerns over how boundaries were drawn
11. Concerns over deliverability of sites
12. Concerns about over allocation of sites
13. Minerals could come from elsewhere/not undertaking Duty to Co-operate/cross border approach is required
14. Settlement protection boundaries and buffer zones

Officer Response

Comments applicable to more than one site

1. With regards to proximity to sensitive receptors. The site options identified through the consultation are being considered with regards to their potential to support mineral extraction in the future. In preparing the new minerals plan, the supporting evidence must be up-to-date, relevant and also proportionate. In the context of identifying potential sites for inclusion in the plan, this means the focus is upon: - broad level environmental constraints; the prospects of being able to realistically achieve acceptable levels of mitigation and the realisation of any positive opportunities. Specific elements of a minerals development such as site accessibility, plant location, extraction faces, landscaping buffering and / or soil storage bunds etc… are presently unknown and will not normally be brought forward until a planning application is submitted. Consequently, in the absence of key development particulars, the MPA are unable to pass judgement as to whether receptors in isolation or cumulatively would be adversely impacted to an irresolvable extent that no mineral extraction should be allowed. This is in respect to dust; particle emissions; blasting vibrations, where relevant; and / or noise levels at noise sensitive properties and other receptors. In the event that a detailed planning proposal is submitted, specialist technical input will be utilised and a proposal will only be allowed if it can be clearly demonstrated that a satisfactory mitigation package will be put in place. This would also apply to whether a HIA is required and if deemed necessary the planning application stage would be the most appropriate time.

2. As mineral working can permanently destroy archaeological remains, archaeology and the settings of designated heritage assets are an important consideration in the formation of the plan. All of the sites have been assessed by a qualified archaeologist as well as being considered by English Heritage and the results are provided within the Site Options Evidence Paper. Furthermore, in addition to national planning policy framework and guidance, there is a proposed plan policy for the Historic Environment as well as proposed Development Management Criteria for the Historic Environment which any forthcoming planning application for minerals would need to accord with. With regards to the setting of heritage assets, it should be noted that minerals developments are effectively temporary in nature and any landscape and restoration schemes would need to be sympathetic when set against assets of historical significance or importance. English Heritage as well as the County Heritage team is also involved with all planning applications and any schemes would need to satisfy the requirements of these qualified consultees.

3. Additional hydrological studies have been undertaken on sites in the Upper
Thames Valley and have helped inform the MPA’s decision over which sites to take forward into the draft MLP.

4. Enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Breaches of other regulatory requirements outside of the County Council’s jurisdiction are a matter for other relevant authorities or appropriate agencies. For example, environmental pollution matters are likely to be dealt with by the Environment Agency.

5. Sites are being allocated with the intention of facilitating the continuation of existing operations and current supply levels over a longer period of time. It is not the intention of the plan to provide for an intensification of existing operations.

6. Any changes or impacts a Public Rights of Way (PRoW) must be in accordance with the law. Gloucestershire County Council is statutorily responsible for maintaining the Definitive PRoW map for Gloucestershire and the PRoW team have been involved with inputting into the Site Options Evidence Paper. Should a planning application come forward which affects the PRoW this would need to be dealt with through the official methods as well as complying with the Proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way. This will include whether satisfactory arrangements for the diversion of the PRoW can be found. In some instances mineral restoration can even result in enhancement of the existing PRoW.

7. Prior to the granting of planning permissions many sites have unsuitable access or infrastructure in place. This is something which needs to be established through the planning application process in discussion with the Highways Authority and where relevant improvements to the existing road network may be required.

8. With regards to birdstrike and potential restoration of the site. It is acknowledged that restoration for many of the sites within the statutory birdstrike zone could be challenging. It is important that restoration proposals will not increase either birdstrike risk or flood risk. However, well designed schemes have been permitted in other parts of the country which fall on land with similar constraints regarding flood zones and birdstrike risk. The MOD has been actively involved in the preparation of the Site Option and their comments have been included in the Site Options evidence paper particularly with regards to potential impacts to RAF Fairford and Brize Norton. However requirements for schemes such as birdstrike management plans would be dependent upon restoration proposals and therefore need to be addressed at planning application stage.

9. With regards to mineral development, the NPPF states 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). This has been transposed into the MLP through the proposed policy for soils and also the proposed restoration policies. Clearly it is preferable that the highest quality agricultural land is preserved for agriculture, however as minerals are not equally dispersed throughout the county; there may be a need to work some better quality agricultural land. In the first instance the Council will take into account as far as practicable the use of land of poorer quality over higher quality in the allocation of sites. However this will need to be balanced against other issues relating to the allocation of suitable sites. In these instances where best and most versatile agricultural land is present the operator would need to clearly demonstrate through the planning application process that the development cannot be met on poorer quality land as well as satisfying the other policy requirements. This may also include a more detailed soil assessment as some of the nationally available datasets relating to soil are not specific enough.

10. The boundaries were consulted upon as presented to the MPA and where appropriate have been revised prior to sites going forward into the draft MLP.

11. Deliverability has been a key issue in determining how and whether sites have been allocated in the draft MLP.

12. Not all sites are required or have been allocated within the draft MLP. Where applications come forward on any Areas of Search the applicant would need to meet strict policy requirements to demonstrate suitability of the proposals.

13. The County Council, alongside all other local authorities in England and some public bodies are duty bound to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis, to maximise the effectiveness of their local plan preparation in the context of responding to strategic cross boundary matters. This duty is known as the 'Duty to Co-operate'. From a minerals planning perspective, the provision of minerals is recognised as potential strategic matter likely to necessitate engagement. The County Council has published an evidence paper to document its present duty to co-operate activities. The paper includes a broad discussion regarding the relationship between Gloucestershire and other neighbouring, and more distant local authorities in terms of identifiable and established supply chains, trends in the movement of minerals, and the likelihood that such circumstances will have a demonstrable influence upon the preparation of the emerging minerals local plan. It is clear that the import to and export of minerals from Gloucestershire will probably have some role to play in maintaining steady and adequate supplies in the future. However, the County Council is not party to any evidence to suggest this will be significant enough to justify a deviation from the present approach of undertaking robust assessments to determine the acceptability of future local mineral working to meet local needs. This is particularly pertinent in the context of the emerging plan's aspiration to facilitate the management of local mineral resources in a sustainable manner as is possible, which incorporates seeking to reduce vehicle movements related to the supply of minerals and the associated vehicle emissions.

14. The issue of settlement protection boundaries is being addressed through the
consideration of responses to the Policy Option. However, the MPA has adopted an approach that where practicable the formal allocation of any land within the UTV will exclude any land within any Settlement Protection Boundaries. Setting a buffer zone of a specific distance is not considered appropriate as many factors can affect the buffer zone including topography, prevailing wind direction and other developments.

**Consultation Outcome**

**SGCW1A Dryleaze Farm/ Shorncliffe**
The MPA is proposing not to include this site in the draft MLP. The site does not have mineral operator interest and there is insufficient evidence to suggest whether there would be suitable material within the parcel. Realistically the site is too small to be considered as an Area of Search, it is a small island surrounded by a mineral site which is almost worked out. Should an operator wish to apply to extract minerals on this site in the future it would be small enough to be considered against policy MA2.

**SGCW2A Cerney Wick**
The MPA is proposing not to include this site in the draft MLP. The site does not have mineral operator interest and there is insufficient evidence to suggest whether there would be suitable material within the parcel. Furthermore the site is in multiple land ownership which further reduces the realistic prospects of mineral extraction. However, should an operator wish to apply to extract minerals on part of this site in the future it would be suitable to be considered against policy MA2.

**SGCW3A Horcott/Lady Lamb Farm**
The MPA is proposing to include this site in the draft MLP. The site does not have mineral operator interest and there is no evidence to suggest a planning application for mineral extraction on the site would be forthcoming during the plan period, meaning that the site would be unsuitable for allocation as a preferred area. However, the landowner is willing for the site to be allocated and should mineral operator interests be found the site could provide a valuable contribution towards the sand and gravel landbank. Therefore it is suitable for allocation as an area of search.

**SGCW3B Horcott/Lady Lamb Farm**
The MPA is proposing not to include this site in the draft MLP. The site does not have mineral operator interest. Furthermore the site is in multiple land ownership some of whom do not wish the site to be included which further reduces the realistic prospects of mineral extraction. However, should an operator wish to apply to extract minerals on part of this site in the future it would be suitable to be considered against policy MA2.

**SGCW4A Kempsford/Whelford**
The MPA is proposing to not include this site in the draft MLP. Although the site does have mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during plan period, the site itself is too small for a strategic site allocation and could be considered under Policy MA02 Aggregate working outside of preferred areas.

**SGCW4B Kempsford/Whelford**
The MPA is proposing to include this site in the draft MLP as an Area of Search. The site does not have mineral operator interest and there is no evidence to suggest a planning application for mineral extraction on the site would be forthcoming during the
plan period, meaning that the site would be unsuitable for allocation as a preferred area. However, the landowner is willing for the site to be allocated and should mineral operator interests be found the site could provide a valuable contribution towards the sand and gravel landbank. Therefore it is suitable for allocation as an area of search.

SGCW4C Kempsford/Whelford
The MPA is proposing to include this site in the draft MLP as a Specific Site. There is a high degree of certainty associated with this site. Quite specific details of the planning proposal are known and have been found acceptable in principle subject to the completion of a legal agreement.

SGCW4D/SGCW4E/SGCW4F Kempsford/Whelford
The MPA is proposing to include this site in the draft MLP as an Area of Search. The site does not have mineral operator interest and there is no evidence to suggest a planning application for mineral extraction on the site would be forthcoming during the plan period, meaning that the site would be unsuitable for allocation as a preferred area. However, the landowner is willing for the site to be allocated and should mineral operator interests be found the site could provide a valuable contribution towards the sand and gravel landbank. Therefore it is suitable for allocation as an area of search.

SGCW5A/SGCW5B/SGCW5C Down Ampney and SGCW6A Charham Farm
The MPA is proposing to include this site in the Draft MLP as an Area of Search for the Down Ampney Charham Farm Area. There is no longer any mineral operator interest associated with land in Down Ampney or Charham Farm. The application associated with Area A at Down Ampney has been disposed of. There is currently no evidence to suggest a planning application for mineral extraction on the site would be forthcoming during the plan period, meaning that the site would be unsuitable for allocation as a preferred area. However, the landowner is willing for the site to be allocated and should mineral operator interests be found some smaller part of the site could provide a valuable contribution towards the sand and gravel landbank. Therefore land is suitable for allocation as an area of search.

SGCW7A Whetstone Bridge and SGCW8A Spratsgate Lane
The MPA is proposing to not include these sites in the Draft MLP. Permission has already been granted for mineral extraction at both sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.14</td>
<td>Do you support the allocation of any of the following sites within the MLP for sand and gravel extraction in the Severn Vale?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>Overall 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGTW1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of responses
Do you support the allocation of SGTW1A

Do you support the allocation of SGTW1B

Do you support the allocation of SGTW1C
Do you support the allocation of SGTW2A

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Unsure

Do you support the allocation of SGTW2B

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Unsure

Do you support the allocation of SGTW2C

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- Unsure
Officer Response

It is apparent that there is a clear lack of support for allocation of the site options presented within the Severn Vale.

---

**Section 4: Construction Aggregates**

**Question 4.15**

Sand & Gravel Severn Vale Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

**Total number of responses to the question** | 84

**Summary of responses**

Out of the responses to these sites there were:

- comments applicable to more than one site;
- unique comments

Many of the respondents raised the same or similar issues and these cover the first bullet which have been summarised below. Any unique comments have been responded to individually and can be referred to in the main consultation response report.

**Comments applicable to more than one site**

1. The site has unsuitable access/infrastructure in place or local roads unsuitable.
2. General concerns relating to proximity to sensitive receptors (including residents, historic assets, ecology and hydrology)
3. Loss of view or devaluation of property
4. No need for the mineral/could be obtained from elsewhere
5. High quality agricultural land
6. No confidence in enforcement
7. Concerns about impact upon local economy including tourism and nearby businesses.
8. Potential impact to Public Right of Way
9. Mineral extraction is unsustainable
10. Contravention of Human Rights
11. Sites have not been allocated in previous plans
12. Concerns about water-based restoration
13. Concerns about linkages with Bow Farm in Worcestershire and potential to use Page’s Lane as a plant site. Also some confusion between information contained on a plan circulated by an action group compared with information within the
consultation document.
14. Confusion between the planning application and the Site Option at Page’s Lane.
15. Questions relating to compensation.
16. Gas pipeline in Redpools Farm

Officer Response

Comments applicable to more than one site
1. Prior to the granting of planning permissions many sites have unsuitable access or infrastructure in place. This is something which needs to be established through the planning application process in discussion with the Highways Authority and where relevant improvements to the existing road network may be required. The planning and environmental considerations evidence paper discussed transport issues in Gloucestershire in more detail.

2. With regards to proximity to sensitive receptors. The site options identified through the consultation are being considered with regards to their potential to support mineral extraction in the future. In preparing the new minerals plan, the supporting evidence must be up-to-date, relevant and also proportionate. In the context of identifying potential sites for inclusion in the plan, this means the focus is upon: - broad level environmental constraints; the prospects of being able to realistically achieve acceptable levels of mitigation and the realisation of any positive opportunities. Specific elements of a minerals development such as site accessibility, plant location, extraction faces, landscaping buffering and/or soil storage bunds etc… are presently unknown and will not normally be brought forward until a planning application is submitted. Consequently, in the absence of key development particulars, the MPA are unable to pass judgement as to whether receptors in isolation or cumulatively would be adversely impacted to an irresolvable extent that no mineral extraction should be allowed. This is in respect to dust; particle emissions; blasting vibrations, where relevant; and/or noise levels at noise sensitive properties and other receptors. In the event that a detailed planning proposal is submitted, specialist technical input will be utilised and a proposal will only be allowed if it can be clearly demonstrated that a satisfactory mitigation package will be put in place. This would also apply to whether a HIA is required and if deemed necessary the planning application stage would be the most appropriate time.

3. Unfortunately the planning authority is only able to take into account “material considerations” and issues such as loss of view or negative effect on property values are not material considerations. For further information please see [http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/faq/faqapplyprocess](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/faq/faqapplyprocess).

4. The quantities of aggregates required in Gloucestershire is addressed through the Local Aggregates Assessment and reviewed annually. Whilst a proportion of mineral is exported out of the county, it should also be recognised that the county does also import aggregates and other minerals in. Not every county or unitary authority within the country geologically contains all of the minerals it requires and it has to rely on other authorities to provide minerals to them. The emerging provision coming from the LAA is consistent with Government policy and considered an appropriate basis for the preparation of the MLP.
5. With regards to mineral development, the NPPF states that 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). This has been transposed into the MLP through the proposed policy for soils and also the proposed restoration policies. Clearly it is preferable that the highest quality agricultural land is preserved for agriculture, however as minerals are not equally dispersed throughout the county; there may be a need to work some better quality agricultural land. In the first instance the Council will take into account as far as practicable the use of land of poorer quality over higher quality in the allocation of sites. However this will need to be balanced against other issues relating to the allocation of suitable sites. In these instances where best and most versatile agricultural land is present the operator would need to clearly demonstrate through the planning application process that the development cannot be met on poorer quality land as well as satisfying the other policy requirements. This may also include a more detailed soil assessment as some of the nationally available datasets relating to soil are not specific enough.

6. Enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Breaches of other regulatory requirements outside of the County Council’s jurisdiction are a matter for other relevant authorities or appropriate agencies. For example, environmental pollution matters are likely to be dealt with by the Environment Agency.

7. There is a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development within current national policy and economic development is a core aspect of this. Minerals contribute to economic development not only by generating employment related to the extraction and supply of minerals, but also by facilitating economic development. Housing and other development cannot take place without construction minerals. The positive economic aspects of mineral development need to be carefully balanced against any potential detrimental impacts and the appropriate stage to make this assessment is at planning application stage when all of the specifics of any proposals are known such as plant location, proposed outputs, proposed lorry routes etc. Furthermore all mineral development is temporary in nature with an end date conditioned through the planning permission; in many instances the final restoration proposals can have a positive impact upon tourism.

8. Any changes or impacts a Public Rights of Way (PRoW) must be in accordance with the law. Gloucestershire County Council is statutorily responsible for maintaining the Definitive PRoW map for Gloucestershire and the PRoW team have been involved with inputting into the Site Options Evidence Paper. Should a
planning application come forward which affects the PRoW this would need to be dealt with through the official methods as well as complying with the Proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way. This will include whether satisfactory arrangements for the diversion of the PRoW can be found. In some instances mineral restoration can even result in enhancement of the existing PRoW.

9. Whilst it is acknowledged that once minerals are used they can never be replaced, the Government has attempted to strike a balance between the promotion of sustainable development whilst ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals to supply future development requirements. The use of secondary and recycled aggregates is promoted throughout the plan, but at present there is not any industry within Gloucestershire that enables a significant production of secondary aggregates and there is only a limited quantity of suitable material available to recycle. This means that some mineral extraction is still required to satisfy Gloucestershire’s mineral needs. The plan sets out to husband the mineral resource in accordance with current Government guidelines through policies which allocate preferred areas of minerals, safeguard mineral resources and minimise quarry waste.

10. It is not considered that the plan would be in contravention of the Human Rights Act because the plan does not permit anything. Any potential developer would not be granted planning permission unless they could demonstrate that the proposal would not be in contravention of the Human Rights Act.

11. The fact that the sites have not been previously allocated or considered before is not relevant. The intention when allocating sites in a plan is that they should be delivered during the plan period. Therefore in theory every plan should contain new sites. The sites were not considered at preferred options stage in 2008 because no sites were considered at that stage. The preferred options consultation was carried out under the former planning system which advocated strategic level policies in a Core Strategy followed by site allocations in a subsequent development plan document. Since the introduction of the Localism Act and the NPPF planning authorities are now encouraged to produce composite local plans containing strategic site allocations.

12. Firstly not all mineral extraction automatically results in water-based restoration. Historically much of the land permitted for sand and gravel extraction in the Twyning area, particularly around Abbots Court Farm has been restored to agriculture. Secondly, water-based restoration in the UK does not necessarily lead to stagnant pools of water containing disease carrying insects. Many of the former mineral sites in the county which have had water-based restoration are now designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Key Wildlife Sites supporting a wide range of biodiversity and provide an ideal habitat for many endangered species. Thirdly, any site permitted for mineral extraction must be operated in accordance with the health and safety laws of this country which are regulated by the Health and Safety Executive.

13. It should be pointed out that at no point in this consultation was it suggested that the operator proposes to use Page’s Lane as a location for plant to serve Redpools Farm and Bow Farm. It was stated in the Site Options Evidence Paper
that the operator’s intention was to use the Redpools Farm plant and access location to facilitate Bow Farm. However, these are operator’s aspirations and would not be automatically guaranteed by allocation in a plan. Planning permission would be required for all parcels of land and in particular any land in Worcestershire would need to be considered by Worcestershire County Council. The plan is not attempting to make any assessment as to whether mineral extraction is appropriate in adjacent Worcestershire sites. However, it is relevant to show the site in Worcestershire as being under the same ownership. This is consistent with how other sites on the Gloucestershire/Wiltshire border were portrayed in the consultation document. Please note that an alternate plan referred to in some of the comments has not been produced by the county council and the parcel numbering and information relating to quantities of minerals is different to that produced by the County Council. The 3 million tonnes of material referred to do not form part of this consultation. It is believed that this may be referring to resource areas in Worcestershire. At no point in this consultation was it suggested that the operator proposes to use Page’s Lane as a location for plant to serve Redpools Farm and Bow Farm. It was stated in the Site Options Evidence Paper that the operator’s intention was to use the Redpools Farm plant and access location to facilitate Bow Farm. However, these are operator’s aspirations and would not be automatically guaranteed by allocation in a plan. Planning permission would be required for all parcels of land and in particular any land in Worcestershire would need to be considered by Worcestershire County Council.

14. It should be noted that the consultation was separate to the planning application. This is looking at the site with regards to its potential for allocation in the minerals local plan.


16. Comments noted with regards to the pipeline. The developer would need to demonstrate at planning stage that the site could be worked without causing any detrimental impact upon the pipeline.

Consultation Outcome
SGTW1A & SGTW1B Pages Lane
There is considerable evidence (through historical refused applications) to suggest that constraints at the site may not be possible to mitigate. However should the operator find a solution to satisfactorily overcome the reasons for refusal at the site then the small nature of the site means that it would be suitable for determination against policy MA2.

SGTW1C Pages Lane
In addition to the reasons discussed above for parcels A and B it is the understanding of the MPA that the landowner does not wish to pursue an interest in sand & gravel working at Area C at this time. Therefore the site is undeliverable during the plan period.
SGTW2A-D Redpools Farm
The site has landowner/mineral operator interest and is likely to come forward during the plan period. Whilst potential constraints may have been identified at the site it is considered that there is potential to overcome these through suitable mitigation measures. The four parcels originally considered should be merged into a single parcel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.16</td>
<td>Omission Sites – are there any other sites in addition to those identified as the site options which you think should be consulted as formal allocations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses to the question 6

Summary of responses
Half of the comments were no comments; one related to a specific site option, one suggested some of the existing building stone quarries in the Cotswolds and one proposed a deepening of Stowfield Quarry.

Officer Response
All comments raised have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report. The Stowfield Quarry deepening was consulted upon in February 2015 as an additional site option and the responses are considered under question 4.9 of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.17</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for the working of aggregates outside of preferred areas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses to the question 24

Summary of responses

Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question 4.18</strong></th>
<th>Working Outside of Preferred Areas Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>There were a significant number of objections to this policy as well as a large number of partial support and support. Comments received include: broad support including no comments, a feeling that working should only be within preferred areas, suggestions for amendments, support for a positive statement towards realisation of minerals which would be otherwise sterilised, there was a need for flexibility, policy was flawed or ambiguous, concerns it would open a backdoor for unwelcome development, needs a definition of what constitutes small-scale development, some questions were raised and some statements of fact provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Response</strong></td>
<td>All comments raised have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report. The policy has been incorporated into Policy MA2 Aggregate working outside of allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th><strong>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.19</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the strategic policy aim for alternative aggregates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do you support the proposed Strategic Policy Aim for Alternative Aggregates?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Officer Response** | This is discussed in the officer response to the question below. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section</strong></th>
<th><strong>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.20</strong></td>
<td>Alternative Aggregates Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>Although most respondents supported or partially supported the policy aim, a significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


percentage of them were unsure. Comments received included: factual statements, broad level support including no comments, comments that the policy framework was not strong enough.

**Officer Response**

All comments raised have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options and Draft Policy Framework consultation response report. All strategic policy aims have been incorporated into the strategy, policies and supporting text of the draft MLP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Section 4: Construction Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4.21</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any other comments to make in relation to Section 4 or its supporting evidence base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of responses**

The majority of comments were re-iterating comments raised earlier in the questionnaire, particularly about specific sites. Of the remaining comments some were no comments and others included, not enough time to read all of the supporting evidence, some evidence out of date, that the alternative aggregates figures were wrong, the LAA figures were too high/too low, further information required on water, safeguarding, plan period and sufficient contingency, comments on the NPPF, cross-border approach needed for restoration, lack of sustainability assessment and suggestions for amendments to evidence.

**Officer Response**

All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main Site Options response report.
### Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

#### Question 5.1
Do you support the proposed policy for building stone?

| Total number of responses to the question | 17 |

**Summary of responses**

![Pie chart](image)

**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

### Question 5.2
Building Stone Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 14 |

**Summary of responses**

3 were no comments/observations or little to disagree with. Several of the respondents raised more than one issue. The points raised included: some support, requests for certain aspects to be amended/deleted with some suggestions for changes to wording, policy is too restrictive and/or potentially conflicting, fails to express importance of the Gloucestershire building stone industry, particularly in maintaining heritage, policy is too negatively worded, fails to recognise advantages of using crushed overburden, should be identification of sandstone resources without need for MCAs, questioning of the referencing of need for employment and economy, Oathill Quarry should only be for building stone, Tinkers Ban Quarry should be treated separately within the plan to Huntsmans Quarry and the policy should allow for the working of building stone for new build developments not just maintaining the heritage.

**Officer Response**

The comments have all been responded to individually and can be viewed within the main consultation response report.
### Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

#### Question 5.3
Do you support the proposed policy for brick clay?

| Total number of responses to the question | 14 |

#### Summary of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 5.4
Brick Clay Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 6 |

#### Summary of responses

3 comments were no comments/observations or little to disagree with. One suggested a preferred area should be outlined to avoid conflict with AAP and the other two were queries/suggestions for improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The comments have all been responded to and can be viewed in the main consultation summary report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

#### Question 5.5
Do you support the proposed policy for Engineering Clay?

| Total number of responses to the question | 13 |

#### Summary of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Pie Chart**: Do you support the proposed Policy for Brick Clay?

- **Yes**
- **Partially**
- ** Unsure**
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5.6</strong></td>
<td>Engineering Clay Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of the responses were “no comments/observations” or nothing to disagree with. The other comment was requesting clarification on acceptable timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comments have all been responded to and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5.7</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for small scale coal underground mines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

Question 5.8 Small Scale Underground Mines Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 7

Summary of responses
The majority of respondents had no comments, were generally supportive and/or recognised that the small scale nature of mines and contribution to local heritage. The district council highlighted that the coalfield overlapped with proposed regeneration areas and that there was a need for the two to be compatible. One respondent thought that coal mining, no matter how small-scale, should not be allowed.

Officer Response
The policy has been incorporated into the new single policy for coal working within the Forest of Dean. Individual responses have been addressed within the more detailed consultation response report.

Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

Question 5.9 Do you support the proposed policy for opencast coal?

Total number of responses to the question 15

Summary of responses
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.10</td>
<td>Opencast Coal Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>Comments included: no observations, some support, some questions, no hydrocarbons – should be more focused on renewables, policy should be removed as too environmentally damaging, coalfield overlaps with other planned developments, opencast is unsuitable for AONB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>The policy has been incorporated into the new single policy for coal working within the Forest of Dean. Individual responses have been addressed and can be viewed within the more detailed consultation response report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.11</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for re-working of colliery spoil tips?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.12</td>
<td>Colliery Spoil Tips Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>1 comment was “no observations”, 2 were that opencast coal/hydrocarbon extraction should not be allowed, 1 was that most tips were protected so little scope for extraction and the remaining 2 were asking for clarification or providing suggestions for improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Response
The comments have all been responded to and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>5: Non-Aggregate Minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.13</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

#### Question 5.14

Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons Reasons – please outline the reasons for your answer and any suggested changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 22 |

**Summary of responses**

There was some broad level support for the policy, some partial support with reservations or with suggestions for amendment and some no comments. A significant number of the responses were opposed to the principle of fracking and the potential environmental impacts which have been associated with fracking.

Officer Response

The County Council as Mineral Planning Authority has the responsibility of handling planning applications for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons in accordance with national policy. Since the consultation licensed areas have now been offered in Gloucestershire and the policy has been re-drafted to take consideration of this as well as the comments received and changed to national policy. All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

### Section 5: Non-Aggregate Minerals

#### Question 5.15

Do you have any other comments to make in regards to Section 5 or its supporting evidence base?

| Total number of responses to the question | 6 |

**Summary of responses**

4 of the comments were no comments/observations. One comment was reiterating responses to earlier questions with regards to climate change. The other comments suggested that the MLP should provide guidance as to the potential impact.

Officer Response

All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main...
consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP.
Section 6. Environmental Considerations

Question 6.1 Do you support the proposed policy for flood risk?

Total number of responses to the question 23

Summary of responses

Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

---

Section 6. Environmental Considerations

Question 6.2 Flood Risk Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 19

Summary of responses

The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. The comments provided included, no comments, request for more information on the implications of extracting below the water table, suggestions for amendments to policy, ambiguity in policy wording, policy not thorough enough, difficult for laypersons to understand, FRA should be undertaken by the LLFRA not developer, comments specific to certain sites, climate change, cumulative impact, no extraction should taken place in Zone 3a, statements of fact.

Officer Response

In preparing the draft minerals local plan the County Council has sought to ensure a sufficient policy framework will be in place to appropriately consider water environment and water resources matters, which could be impacted by minerals working. An aim for the policy framework is to see that all minerals planning proposals are subject to the requirement, to provide sufficiently detailed water-related assessments of risk, and / or impacts, and / or mitigation, where this matter has been identified. The County Council will also be looking for the relevant authoritative statutory bodies – such as the Environment Agency to consider this information and to provide technical advice. Already, in respect of this, the Environment Agency is seeking a minimum of two years ground water monitoring data, where significant impacts upon aquifers are deemed a possibility. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP. The comments can all be viewed in the main consultation response report.
### Section 6. Environmental Considerations

#### Question 6.3
Do you support the proposed policy for water quality?

| Total number of responses to the question | 22 |

**Summary of responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing support for water quality policy]

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Partially**
- **Unsure**

---

#### Question 6.4
Water Quality Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 14 |

**Summary of responses**

The majority of respondents either supported or partially supported the policy. Comments made in regards to the policy include that the policy is weak and does not contain enough protection for ground water, suggestions for amendments to the policy, statements of fact, no comments, need clarification in supporting text and further information for developers, need confirmation research is of highest quality, references to specific sites and / or existing situations.

**Officer Response**

In preparing the draft minerals local plan the County Council has sought to ensure a sufficiently robust policy framework will be in place to appropriately consider safeguarding and / or potential enhancement of water quality, where mineral working – including within the Upper Thames Valley resource area, may likely prove to be influential. An aim of this policy framework is to see that all minerals planning proposals are subject to the requirement, to provide sufficiently detailed water-related assessments of risk, and / or impacts, and / or appropriate and achievable mitigation, where these matters have been identified and are likely to be of significance. The County Council will also be looking for the relevant authoritative statutory bodies – such as the Environment Agency to consider submitted information and to provide technical advice accordingly. Regarding the specific concern over present mineral operations, this is a matter that falls outside of the sphere of influence of the emerging plan and is very much an issue for active planning enforcement, undertaken through the County Council Development Management Service. Nevertheless, any lessons learnt from the ability to successfully
enforce upon conditions placed upon on the associated planning approvals, will be taken on board in preparing the new mineral local plan. The proposed draft flood risk policy that has been taken forward with the draft minerals local plan affords provision to apply the well-establishing zoning mechanism as articulated locally through Gloucestershire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and which is in accordance with national policy and best practice. The draft policy also seeks the requirement of prospective applicants to undertake more detailed assessment of risk and means of mitigation depending upon the identified strategic risk zone. This is deemed wholly reasonable and proportionate for the purposes of the emerging policy framework. Additional prescribed buffer zones replicated and / or introducing other requirements would run contrary to the balanced approach that is being pursued. The points that have been raised regarding River Basin Management Plans and other sources of evidence are noted and have been taken in account by the County Council during the preparation of the draft minerals local plan. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP. The comments can all be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.5</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you support the proposed policy for Landscape?

Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.6</td>
<td>Landscape Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>The majority of people either supported or partially supported the policy. The comments include: No reference for need to undertake rigorous landscape assessment, long term restoration potential to damage AONB, policy too weak with regards to AONB, comments specific to certain sites or re-emphasising previous comments elsewhere,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
need to refer to landscape character assessments, suggested amendments to wording, broad level support for policy, no comments, concerns lead to islands in the Cotswolds Water Park, long-term restoration can fundamentally alter landscapes, climate change, no mention of quality of life for local people, do not support national tests.

Officer Response

In preparing the draft minerals local plan, the County Council has sought to ensure that a sufficiently robust policy framework will be in place to prevent unsuitable minerals development from occurring. Detailed landscape & visual impact assessments have been commissioned, which include more localised landscape character assessments. The draft plan has also reflected these matters and appropriately referenced local landscape character delineations. With regards to AONB, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that as far as practicable landbanks for non-energy minerals should be maintained from outside of certain designated areas including AONBs. However, in Gloucestershire almost all of the Jurassic limestone and a significant proportion of the Carboniferous limestone are within an AONB. Indeed over 80% of the remaining crushed rock reserves in Gloucestershire are within AONBs designations. Consequently, any minerals development that takes place in an AONB must ensure that impacts on this special status are satisfactorily mitigated. Specifically, in consideration of restoration matters with the emerging draft plan, the policy aim for any AONB mineral sites is to seek the achievement of restoration programmes that occur at the earliest, practicable opportunity, to a high environmental standard that is reflective of the landscape and scenic value of the designation, and that will also give sufficient attention to matters of wildlife conservation and cultural heritage. The collective suite of emerging policies, including those that seek to prevent unacceptable landscape impacts, have sought to ensure that inappropriate and potentially adverse minerals development will be prevented from occurring. This is whether they are specifically within or on fringes of a delineated designation like an AONB. The County Council has sought to ensure that all key factors that could affect the special qualities of AONB designations are fully accounted for in line with national policy. This includes environmental economic and social matters. With regards to restoration the Council has sought to present a policy framework governing final restoration that will be sufficiently flexible to respond to differing factors that may be present with individual sites and circumstances. An overly rigid post-extraction solution will not be appropriate. The key policy concern is the ability to achieve agreeable and achievable solutions that will occur as early as is practically possible and to the highest environmental standards. For example; with mineral extraction in the Upper Thames Valley, one important factor is proximity to RAF Fairford. Those minerals sites nearby to the airbase may need to achieve dry after-use as a means of reducing the risk of bird strike. For those sites that are more distal, a wet restoration solution with inland lake after-uses might prove a more achievable and desirable solution. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.7</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for mineral working in the Green Belt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of responses
Section 6. Environmental Considerations

Question 6.8  Green Belt Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 9

Summary of responses
The majority of respondents either supported or partially supported the policy. The comments received included broad level support or no comments and a number of people who wanted to see the green belt left undisturbed some cited effect on amenity or poor restoration as reasons for not disturbing the green belt.

Officer Response
Mineral extraction in the green belt is not contrary to national policy, but certain associated activities have the potential to be harmful to the green belt therefore the policy needs to be clearly defined in order to protect the green belt form harm. The draft new minerals local plan, considers mineral working in the Green Belt as a temporary operation, which does not necessarily contravene the purposes of the Green Belt, Nevertheless, in the event that working is proposed, the County Council has also sought provision through the draft policy, to ensure that the highest environmental standards of restoration are achieved and that this is done as quickly as practicably possible. This approach is in line with national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and should ensure sufficiently robust planning controls will be place to protect the Gloucester-Cheltenham Green Belt. It would be overly rigid to stipulate within policy, a specific timescale for the achievement of a particular after-use, following restoration. The variability in scale and site circumstances with minerals development means that a more flexible approach is more appropriate. However, the focus upon the rapidity of any proposed restoration does aim to highlight the significance of this issue with any prospective minerals operator whom is considering minerals development within the Gloucester-Cheltenham Green Belt. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.9</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for biodiversity and geodiversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you support the proposed Policy for Biodiversity and Geodiversity?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.10</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Geodiversity Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. The comments included broad level support or no comments, re-emphasis of earlier comments or comments related to specific site options or parts of Gloucestershire, suggestions for amendments to policy, could be strengthened by making reference to green infrastructure, statements of fact, climate change, not enough clarity on landscape-scale restoration, needs a balance between restoration and need for agriculture, policy weakened by “let-out” clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>The biodiversity policy will need to be considered alongside other policies within the plan including restoration and landscape policies. In preparing the draft minerals local plan the County Council has sought to ensure a sufficient policy framework will be in place to appropriately consider the matters of biodiversity and geo-diversity. In doing so, attention has been given to the wide range of other desirable planning-related objectives being looked at through the plan. Policy provision has been made to ensure that balance can be achieved between these differing objectives, depending upon the circumstances prevailing at any given time and location. The County Council has sought to ensure a sufficient policy framework will be in place to appropriately consider matters of habitat and landscape, which could be impacted by mineral working. Under differing circumstances, the framework aims to facilitate the protection of valued habitats and landscape where it reasonable and proportionate to do so, to seek improvement and enhancement of these assets; and / or a change in their characteristics, particularly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where desirable biodiversity and / or geo-diversity objectives are deemed achievable. It is acknowledged by the County Council that facilitating mineral working through the provision of a mineral plan will have an impact upon certain habitats and environments, and may result in permanent change. However, such changes may not always be negative and may support the achievement of desirable and beneficial biodiversity and / or geo-diversity objectives. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

Section 6. Environmental Considerations

Question 6.11 Do you support the proposed policy for the Historic Environment?
Total number of responses to the question 18

Summary of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support the proposed Policy for the Historic Environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

Section 6. Environmental Considerations

Question 6.12 Historic Environment Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy
Total number of responses to the question 10

Summary of responses
The majority of people showed support or partial support for the policy. Most of the comments received suggested revising the policy to strengthen it, improve the grammar and to clarify that historic environment includes all historic features/settings not just archaeological ones.

Officer Response
The policy has been completely re-drafted in accordance with advice from the statutory consultee; other comments have also been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP. The decision to allow mineral working occurs only once detailed planning information has been assessed through a planning application. It is at this stage that decision makers are required to weigh up the differing, and often competing matters affecting a proposal. The purpose of the emerging minerals local plan is bring to the
attention of all interested parties of the types of matter that are anticipated to occur with future proposals; to offer guidance as to how such matters might be given consideration; and to afforded a general view of the significance of each matter that arises. The aim of the plan is to act as a useful tool in assisting decision makers arrive at a transparent, considered and defendable decision. In preparing the draft minerals local plan the County Council has sought to ensure a sufficient policy framework will be in place to appropriately account for historic environment assets, which could be impacted by the prospect of minerals working. For clarification, the County Council adopts the definition used in national guidance, which sees heritage assets as those buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration because of their heritage interest. These may be formally designated or identified locally. Furthermore, this policy framework will be scrutinised and assessed in respect of its validity and suitableness by the authoritative statutory bodies – such as English Heritage. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

### Section 6. Environmental Considerations

#### Question 6.13

Do you have any comments in relation to the proposed DM Criteria for the Historic Environment?

| Total number of responses to the question | 4 |

**Summary of responses**

The comments include no comments, historic environment should take priority over minerals and operations should be differentiated from restoration as affect settings.

**Officer Response**

The issues raised have been discussed in more detail in question 6.12. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

#### Question 6.14

Do you support the proposed policy for sustainable transport?

| Total number of responses to the question | 21 |

**Summary of responses**
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Sustainable Transport Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>The majority of people showed support or partial support for the policy. Comments received include broad level support and no comments, support for alternate transport methods including mention of specific sites, comments raised elsewhere in the document including reference to site options, policy is contradictory, suggestions for amendments, requests for definition of terms in supporting text, need for consultation with adjacent authorities, lorry routeing, too brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>In preparing the draft new minerals local plan, the County Council has sought to ensure that an appropriate policy framework for considering transportation matters surrounding minerals development will be in place. A key aspect of this is provision for sufficiently robust, but defensible assessment requirements to be sought by the County Council that will mean road hauled minerals are effectively managed – this in certain circumstances, may mean routing strategies that seek the avoidance of particular roads for HGVs, and / or other mitigation solutions, that collectively seek to prevent adverse impacts on communities and local environments. The established position, for which there is no evidence of a likely change during the lifespan of the emerging plan, is that minerals will mostly be moved by road within Gloucestershire. Consequently, the emerging plan must address this fact proportionately through policy. Nevertheless, at a strategic-level, the present dominance of road haulage should not be seen as an unchallengeable and / or a favourable approach. More sustainable alternatives such as rail and waterborne mineral transport have therefore been elevated and are the directed preference for decision makers, qualified where it is practicable to be delivered and will not potentially create more adversity with environmental and amenity assets than conventional road haulage. Finally, the intention of the statement concerning extensions to existing quarries and road movements, was seeking to advise of a general presumption, which has been...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
taken forward with the emerging draft plan, that utilising existing infrastructure, which includes the road network, will likely result in an overall reduction in impacts, when compared against facilitating the proliferation of mineral workings in any given locality through allowing brand new sites to open up. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>6. Environmental Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 6.16</td>
<td>Do you have any other comments to make in relation to Section 7 or its supporting evidence base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>The comments received include no comments, re-emphasis of earlier comments; need to address hydrology, more on impact to residents and a lack of impartiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>7. Minerals Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 7.1</td>
<td>Do you support the proposed Strategic Policy Aim for the Cotswold Water Park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Pie chart" /> Do you support the proposed Strategic Policy Aim for the Cotswold Water Park?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7.2  Strategic Policy Aim CWP Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 10

Summary of responses
Most people indicated support or partial support for the Policy Aim; however some felt that the Policy Aim was too vague. Some respondents made suggestions as to how it could be improved such as including references to canal restoration, including all aspects of mineral development not just restoration. Others made comments with regards to the implementation, Duty to Co-operate and the need to pay regard to the Cotswold Water Park Masterplan.

Officer Response
Whilst there was a majority support or partial support for the Policy Aim, for clarification purposes it has been decided that all strategic policy aims within the plan will be incorporated into the plan’s overarching strategy. The strategy has been written so as to take account of the comments received to all the strategic policy aims which are available to view in the main, detailed consultation response report.

Section 7. Minerals Restoration
Question 7.3  Do you support the proposed policy for restoration?
Total number of responses to the question 18

Summary of responses

Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

Section 7. Minerals Restoration
Question 7.4  Restoration Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 21

Summary of responses
The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. The comments received related to: length of time between extraction and restoration, suggestions for
amendments to wording, not strong enough, needs more clarification/definitions, needs more flexibility, broad level support and no comments, statement of fact, needs better enforcement, difficulties in Cotswold Water Park related to landscape changes, flooding, birdstrike and infilling.

Officer Response

The NPPF encourages phased restoration of mineral sites and therefore it is supported by the proposed policy. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission, for example not following an approved restoration scheme. Enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Breaches of other regulatory requirements outside of the County Council’s jurisdiction are a matter for other relevant authorities or appropriate agencies. For example, environmental pollution matters are likely to be dealt with by the Environment Agency. The proposals for restoration will have to be submitted alongside the application for extraction. Therefore they will be judged against the policies in the adopted local plan, regardless of when it is submitted. The proposed restoration policy encourages restoration to take place in phases and to take place as soon as practicable after extraction. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

Section 7. Minerals Restoration

Question 7.5 Do you support the proposed DM restoration policy?

Total number of responses to the question 7

Summary of responses

| Do you support the proposed Development Management Restoration Policy? |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | Partially | Unsure |
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>7. Minerals Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 7.6</strong></td>
<td>DM Restoration Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of responses to the question**: 20

**Summary of responses**
The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. The comments received related to: suggestions of changes to wording, need for enforcement/effective restoration management, not reasonable to expect developers to pay for reconstruction of canal unless they have damaged it, broad level support or no comments, must not pose birdstrike risk, should make reference to amenity and heritage protection, requirement to restore to best and most versatile agricultural land weak and impractical.

**Officer Response**
Enforcement is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Clearly it is preferable that the highest quality agricultural land is preserved for agriculture, however as minerals are not equally dispersed throughout the county; there may be a need to work some better quality agricultural land. In the first instance the Council will take into account as far as practicable the use of land of poorer quality over higher quality in the allocation of sites. However this will need to be balanced against other issues relating to the allocation of suitable sites. In these instances where best and most versatile agricultural land is present the operator would need to clearly demonstrate through the planning application process that the development cannot be met on poorer quality land as well as satisfying the other policy requirements. This may also include a more detailed soil assessment as some of the nationally available datasets relating to soil are not specific enough. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>7. Minerals Restoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 7.7</strong></td>
<td>Do you have any other comments relation to Section 7 or its evidence base?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of responses to the question**: 8

**Summary of responses**
There were 8 responses to this question and 4 of those were “no comments”. The remaining comments were broadly supportive of the restoration policies; however, concerns were raised over whether it is appropriate to expect developers to fund canal restoration unless the mineral working had damaged the canal and also with regards to the practicalities of being able to mitigate bird strike risk without increasing flood risk due to importation of inert materials. Natural England indicated that they would be prepared
to offer site specific advice where bird strike risk may be an issue.

**Officer Response**

Any restoration scheme that is submitted for a minerals site would have to be assessed again all of the policies in the plan. This would include those on flood risk and water quality. The restoration policy has been reworded for the draft MLP to take comments into account. The policy will need to be considered alongside all other policies within the plan. Permission would not be granted if an applicant could not successfully demonstrate that the proposal would be able to mitigate the risk of both birdstrike and flooding. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.1</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for mitigation of environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Officer Response**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.2</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation of Environmental Effects Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was some broad level support for the policy and some “no comments”, whilst others stated the policy was vague and questioned its appropriateness given there are other pollution control regimes in place. Some suggestions were made as to how the policy should be amended. There was a comment in relation to noise pollution and one related to climate change.

**Officer Response**

All of the responses have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The principal elements of the policy have been incorporated into Policy DM1 Amenity taking into account the responses received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.3</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for ancillary development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.4</strong></td>
<td>Ancillary Development Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>The majority of responses showed a broad level support for the policy and three provided suggestions as to how the policy could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Response</strong></td>
<td>All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The policy has been re-written for the draft MLP as MW7 Ancillary Development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.5</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for safeguarding aerodromes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of responses to the question</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 8: Other Policies

#### Question 8.6

**Safeguarding Aerodromes Reasons** – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 7 |

**Summary of responses**

Two responses were no comments/nothing to disagree with. 1 response felt that the policy was potentially over-restrictive and the remaining responses were emphasising the importance of aviation safety and minimising the risk of birdstrike.

**Officer Response**

The MOD has been and will be consulted at all stages of plan preparation and any comments they raise are will be incorporated into the plan. They will also be consulted on any planning applications which are in the vicinity of any MOD airbases. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The policy has been re-written for the Draft MLP as Policy DM11 Aerodrome safeguarding and aviation safety.

---

#### Question 8.7

**Do you support the proposed policy for planning obligations?**

| Total number of responses to the question | 15 |

**Summary of responses**
Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.8  Planning Obligations Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 19

Summary of responses

All respondent supported or partially supported the policy. The comments received include: suggestions for amendments, suggestions for implementation, queries over monitoring, factual statements, request for clarification, and references to the legitimacy of the policy.

Officer Response

Although there was a large level of support for the policy, in light of the responses received, the policy as presented will not be taken forward into the draft MLP and we are now considering how best to incorporate the subject of developer contributions in the draft MLP bearing in mind that the approach to and practical implementation of S.106 development contributions are now enshrined into legislation through the CIL Regulations. With regards to enforcement it is important as a means of maintaining public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. The County Council is the Minerals & Waste Planning Authority (MPA) for Gloucestershire and has associated powers of enforcement against unauthorised development defined as a ‘county matter’. Enforcement powers cover such circumstances as breaches of conditions attached to an extant planning permission and the carrying out of development, where no planning permission has been granted. Breaches of other regulatory requirements outside of the County Council’s jurisdiction are a matter for other relevant authorities or appropriate agencies. For example, environmental pollution matters are likely to be dealt with by the Environment Agency. Please also refer to consultation summary response report. The individual comments can all be viewed in the main consultation response report.
### Section 8: Other Policies

#### Question 8.9
Do you support the proposed policy for borrow pits?

| Total number of responses to the question | 12 |

**Summary of responses**

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

---

#### Question 8.10
Borrow Pits Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

| Total number of responses to the question | 7 |

**Summary of responses**

There were some comments showing a broad level support or no comments. Other comments provided suggestions for amendments to the wording or requested clarification on the terminology.

**Officer Response**

All of the comments have been taken into consideration and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The policy has not been carried forward into the draft MLP and any proposal would need to be assessed against the relevant MW policy.

---

#### Question 8.11
Do you support the proposed policy for cumulative impacts?

| Total number of responses to the question | 14 |

**Summary of responses**
Do you support the proposed Policy for Cumulative Impact?

Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.12
Cumulative Impact Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question 13

Summary of responses
The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. The concerns highlighted include amenity, cross border issues, flooding, environment and biodiversity, heritage and cycleways. There were also suggestions for amendments to the policy.

Officer Response
The aim of the policy is to ensure that mineral development will not have a negative impact upon heritage assets, the amenity of local residents and environmental quality including biodiversity and geodiversity. The policy would be relevant to all mineral planning applications not just those coming forward any sites allocated within the plan. The new regulations on Duty to Co Operate will require continued discussions with relevant stakeholders in the plan making process. When planning applications are received for sites within close proximity of the county boundary the neighbouring authority is consulted. All of the comments have been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The policy has been incorporated into Policy DM2 Cumulative Impact.

Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.13
Do you support the proposed policy for soils?

Total number of responses to the question 13

Summary of responses
Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.14  Soils Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy

Total number of responses to the question  8

Summary of responses

The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. Some respondents had no comments or showed broad support. Some respondents felt the policy needed rethinking in line with national policy, provided suggestions for amendments or raised questions as to how the policy would be implemented.

Officer Response

All of the comments have been responded to individually and can be viewed in the main consultation response report. The policy has been incorporated into Policy DM7 Soils, taking the comments raised into consideration.

Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.15  Do you support the proposed policy for PRoW?

Total number of responses to the question  16

Summary of responses
### Officer Response

This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.16</strong></td>
<td>PRoW Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td>The majority of respondents supported or partially supported the policy. Most of the comments highlighted concerns about loss of PRoW or showed support for new paths/cycle paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer Response**

The policy approach within the draft MLP will ensure that foot paths are not lost. If the existing rights of way cannot be kept (for example if they run through a working quarry) then replacements should be made nearby. Completely new schemes including cycle paths would also be considered through the planning application and restoration proposals. The policy has now been incorporated into Policy DM3 Transport. All of the comments have been taken into consideration and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.17</strong></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed policy for Buffer Zones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Pie Chart: Do you support the proposed Policy for Public Rights of Way?](image)
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.18</strong></td>
<td>Buffer Zones Reasons – Please outline the reasons for your answer and any proposed changes to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>The majority of respondents either supported or partially supported the policy. There appeared to be some confusion over terminology and some respondents wanted to see an actual distance prescribed along with better references to people and watercourses. Some comments were very specific to individual sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>The buffer zones for each site would vary depending on the proposal and the surrounding land uses. Therefore it is not possible to specify in policy what these would be. However the aim is to ensure that any impacts from mineral development would be minimised. This policy has not been carried forward into the draft MLP. The policy would be an unnecessary duplication of principles contained within a combination of Policy DM1 Amenity and DM2 Cumulative Impact. These policies will ensure that there would be no unacceptable impact upon neighbouring land uses. All of the comments have taken into consideration and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.19</strong></td>
<td>Do you think that the existing policy E15 should be carried forward into the new MLP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.20
Please outline the reasons as to why policy E15 should be retained or deleted

Total number of responses to the question 12

Summary of responses
The vast majority of respondents supported this policy and made comments in support of the retention of settlement protection zones (SPZs) and more general buffer zones. However, Cotswold District Council has said that they did not support it and would be unlikely to take forward the concept of SPZs into the new Cotswold Local Plan. They suggested a criteria based approach in an enhanced buffer zone policy would be a better method to address the issues.

Officer Response
The comments have all been taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation document. However, this policy has not been carried forward into the draft MLP. The policy would be an unnecessary duplication of principles contained within a combination of Policy DM1 Amenity and DM2 Cumulative Impact.

Section 8: Other Policies

Question 8.21
Do you agree that the following policies do not need to be retained in the MLP (DC3/DC6/E18)?

Total number of responses to the question DC3 = 10; DC6 = 11; E18 = 10

Summary of responses
Officer Response
This is discussed in the officer response to the question below.

### Section 8: Other Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8.22</th>
<th>Reasons for your answer to <em>Do you agree that the following policies do not need to be retained in the MLP</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.22</td>
<td><em>E18: Opportunities for Improved Access</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of responses to the question: 7

Summary of responses
1 response was “no comments”, 1 response was that E18 should be retained. The remaining 5 were concerned with DC3 and E18 and felt that importation should be strictly controlled and that developers should make contributions to the local area.

**Officer Response**

The policies have not been carried forward into the draft MLP. DC3 is now provided for through a combination of Waste Core Strategy Policy WCS8 Landfill, MR1 Restoration, aftercare and facilitating beneficial after-uses and Policy MW4 Brick Clay. DC6 / the practical implications of S.106 is now enshrined in legislation under the CIL Regulations and therefore the policy is unnecessary. E18 has been incorporated into Policy DM3 Transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8: Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 8.23</td>
<td>Do you have any comments in relation to General Development Criteria / Validation checklist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>3 of the responses had no additional comments. The remaining comments focused on providing suggestions for amendments, cross-referencing with policies and suggestions for additional information to include.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>Individual responses have been addressed within the larger consultation response report. The draft MLP will incorporate the development requirements into the policy implementation requirements. Following examination/adoption of the plan, it is anticipated that the validation checklist will be further revised to incorporate new requirements or changes to validation requirements necessary for the plan to be successfully implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>8. Other Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 8.24</td>
<td>Do you have any other comments in relation to Section 8 or its supporting evidence base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of responses to the question</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of responses</td>
<td>4 of the 7 responses were either “no comments” or an informative. 2 raised issues that would be dealt with either by specific policies or at the planning application stage. The other comment was querying the NPPF compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Response</td>
<td>The plan when viewed as a whole will be NPPF compliant and contain sufficient policy provision to ensure that important issues such as amenity protection or highways impacts will be adequately considered at the planning application stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 9: Implementation and Monitoring plus “Other Documents”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Implementation and Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 9.1</td>
<td>Do you have any general comments in relation to Section 9L Implementation and Monitoring?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of responses to the question**: 10

**Summary of responses**

Of the 10 responses, 4 were simply stating “no comments”, 3 were related to other questions/sections or re-emphasising points already raised such as objecting to a site, or unhappy about the consultation in general. The remaining 3 questions were generally supportive of the proposed framework, monitoring in general and the inclusion of the validation checklist with recommendations for how this could be enhanced.

**Officer Response**

The comments will taken into consideration when preparing the draft Minerals Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Other documents – Sustainability Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 9.2</td>
<td>Do you have any comments in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of responses to the question**: 7

**Summary of responses**

Of the 7 responses 2 were “no comments” and 1 was informing us that the stakeholder had not had time to review the document. Two stakeholders made comments in relation to the assessments at particular sites and one felt that further detailed assessments needed to be undertaken with regards to Health, Social and Economic impacts.

Historic England, the statutory advisor for heritage felt that more in-depth assessments needed to be undertaken on the heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposals and he recommended a process to follow in order to make the assessments. Natural England, the statutory advisor the natural environment was supportive of the process undertake.

**Officer Response**

The SA process was undertaken by an independent consultant with specialist knowledge in the SA field in order for it to be as objectively undertaken as possible. The methodology and subsequent scoring was carried out independently from the County Council. The comments received to this section of the consultation will be sent to the consultants to assist them with SA of the draft Minerals Plan.
### Question 9.3
**Other documents – Habitats Regulations Assessments**

| Total number of responses to the question | 7 |

**Summary of responses**

Of the 7 responses, 4 were “no comment” or “not had time to review”. Of the 3 remaining 2 stated that they felt that an up-to-date Appropriate Assessment was required and that the consultation stage was invalid without it. However, Natural England, the statutory advisor for this area, was satisfied with the process undertaken.

**Officer Response**

A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been produced for the Minerals Local Plan. Stage 1 is screening for a likely significant effect. This stage has concluded that no aspects of the plan alone or in-combination with other plans and projects could have a likely significant effect on any European Site. Stage 2 of HRA is therefore not required. Natural England have agreed the approach taken and the outcome of the HRA for the MLP so far (response 18/08/14). All planning applications that come forward in the future would have to meet the criteria of all of the relevant policies which cover landscape and ecology.

### Question 9.4

| Total number of responses to the question | 41 |

**Summary of responses**

Whilst there were 41 comments allocated to this section, this was the section where additional information had been placed such as introductory paragraphs where responses had been made by letter. As such many of the responses were largely informative or were repeating comments made earlier in the consultation. Some respondents objected to the technical nature of the consultation, that they found the consultation document and the questionnaire too lengthy, too confusing and too full of terminology. However, other respondents did say that the consultation was clearly presented. Some consultees felt that the consultations and/or roadshows were not adequately publicised.

Several respondents also raised concerns regarding whether Duty to Co-operate had been adequately undertaken and that Gloucestershire should be seeking to make provision from outside of the county under DtC arrangements.

**Officer Response**

The comments have all been addressed individually within the main consultation response report.

With regards to the Minerals Local Plan is adopted it will be a technical document and needs to comply with certain legal requirements. The consultation document was the first attempt to draw together and present all of the elements that would be contained within the adopted MLP. The consultation document could not be any shorter without losing important details. Every effort was made to make the consultation document as accessible as possible and clear signposting to the supporting evidence base was also included. The questionnaire was structured in a way that consultees were not obliged to
complete every question and could just skip to the area of interest to them. It is considered that more publicity and effort was made to engage with consultees over and above that outlined in the Statement of Community Involvement. The roadshows were an example of additional consultation. The County Council does not have the resources to leaflet drop entire areas, but those residents living closest to the proposed sites were consulted directly and the parish and town councils were also consulted. Details of how the County Council has engaged with strategic partners under Duty to Co-operate are outlined within the DtC evidence paper. Additional DtC engagement will be undertaken prior to the draft MLP consultation in 2016. Again this will be reported in a separate evidence paper. This is discussed in more detail within Section 4 of this report.

The draft MLP will contain a full suite of policies designed to provide a mechanism through the planning process whereby permission will not be granted unless it can be successfully demonstrated that adverse amenity, environmental other potentially harmful impacts can be successfully mitigated.

All of the comments have taken into consideration when preparing the draft MLP and can be viewed in the main consultation response report.