

Appendix: Consultation Questions and Gedling Borough's response

Q1: Do you think any further information should be included in the overview of the area?

Response: No comments.

Q2: Do you agree with the draft vision? Are there other things we should include?

Response: The vision is supported.

Q3: Are the strategic issues appropriate? Are there others we should consider?

Response: Yes the strategic issues are appropriate.

Q4: Do you think the average 10 year sales figure the most suitable methodology for forecasting future aggregate demand in Nottinghamshire. If not please identify any alternatives you feel are realistic and deliverable and the evidence to support this approach.

Response: Yes this approach accords with National Planning policy.

Q5: Do you think the same methodology (most recent average 10 years sales) should be used for each aggregate or is there merit in using different methodologies for different aggregates?

Response: Yes agreed.

Q6: Do you think extensions to existing permitted quarries should be prioritised over new greenfield quarries?

Response: In general yes.

Q7: Should different approaches (new sites/extensions to existing permitted quarries) be adopted for individual mineral types?

Response: This is unlikely to be necessary as the various impacts from different types of mineral extraction are similar.

Q8: How important is it to maintain a geographical spread of sand and gravel quarries across the County (i.e. Idle Valley, near Newark and near Nottingham) to minimise the distance minerals are transported to markets?

Response: No comments.

Q9: Would it be more appropriate to prioritise specific areas above others?

Response: No comments.

Q10: Is it economical to transport mineral by river barge and if so should proposed quarries with the potential for moving sand and gravel by river barge be prioritised over other proposals?

Response: No comments.

Q11: Are you aware of any other issues relating to Sherwood Sandstone provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: not aware of any other issues. GBC notes that NCC has received a planning application for an extension to the Bestwood 2 quarry for an additional 1.4 million tonnes. The County has consulted the Borough Council on the planning application and there is no need for further comment.

Q12: Is there evidence to suggest that additional crushed rock reserves are required to meet demand in Nottinghamshire over the Plan period? If so please provide this evidence.

Response: No comments.

Q13: Are you aware of any other issues relating to crushed rock provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.

Q14: Are you aware of any issues relating to alternative aggregates that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.

Q15: Should the Plan identify a specific replacement quarry (remote extension/ new site) to Dorket Head clay pit or should a criteria based policy be developed to ensure that an adequate supply of clay can be maintained over the Plan period?

Response: GBC acknowledges the importance of the Ibstock Brickworks to the local economy and the local jobs it provides. The Issues and options document's text indicates exhaustion of the Dorket Head permitted clay resource around 2030 well before the end of the plan period. The Issues and Options document also states that apart from the proposed small southern extension there are unlikely to be any further options to extend the clay pit. Assuming the MLP is adopted in 2019 then the individual land bank for Dorket Head would be just over 10 years supply less than half the 25 year supply advised by National guidance. GBC considers it is important to identify additional resource at the earliest opportunity through a plan led approach and GBC's preferred option would be for a site specific allocation for a remote extension/new site with its second preference being a sufficiently concise area of

search. This would provide the most certainty for the both the operator, the local community and assist in forward planning at the Borough level.

At the recent examination hearings into the GBC Local Planning Document, GBC agreed to identify the Ibstock Brickworks as a protected employment site. In this context we would also wish to flag up our recent discussions with you where it was agreed that NCC as MPA would consider the inclusion of a policy in support of brick manufacture at the Dorket Head within its Minerals Local Plan (please see document **EX/107** on the GBC LPD examination web site).

Q16: Is a criteria based policy the most suitable approach to cover the potential for new brick works and associated clay pits?

Response: Given the importance of the brickworks, the location and sheer extent of the identified clay resource GBC would have concerns about relying on a criteria based policy.

Q17: Should the plan seek to identify specific site allocations for Gypsum provision or should a criteria based policy be developed to ensure an adequate supply of Gypsum can be maintained over the Plan period?

Response: No comments.

Q18: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of Gypsum that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.

Q19: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of silica sand that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.

Q20: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of industrial dolomite that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan Review?

Response: No comments.

Q21: Is there evidence to suggest that additional building stone reserves are required to meet demand in Nottinghamshire over the Plan period? If so please provide this evidence

Response: GBC notes the comments on Yellowstone Quarry at Linby where there are significant reserves to 2035. It is agreed there is unlikely to be a shortage of building stone over the MLP plan period.

Q22: Are you aware of any other issues relating to building stone provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: Not aware of any other issues.

Q23: Are you aware of any issues relating to coal extraction that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No

Q24: Are you aware of any issues relating to hydrocarbon extraction that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.

Q25: Do you agree with the proposed development management policy areas? Are there any others that should be covered?

Response: The list looks comprehensive.

Q26: Are you aware of any issues relating to minerals safeguarding that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Response: No comments.