

EAST RIDING
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**Joint Minerals DPD Issues and Options
consultation of May 2008**

March 2010

Issues and Response Form – Joint Minerals Plan Document Question A & B							
	Strategic Objectives			Minerals Policy			
	Question A - Do you agree that the suggested objectives are appropriate for the Joint Minerals Development Plan Document	Comment	Response	Question B - Do you agree with the suggested Minerals Core Policy?	Comment	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	No	The second point refers to 'steady supply' implies a steady demand. This is factually a false concept. The process is demand led and varies very widely. Suggest delete 'steady' here and elsewhere. Otherwise ok.	The objective in line with MPS 1 which is Government Guidance that sets out National Objectives for mineral.	No	Hull has no Minerals: suggest delete 'and Hull' in line 1. The second point is meaning less as far Council can affected/control it.	Comment noted	
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	No	Needs to have objective to safeguard ports and railheads	Comment noted the issue is considered in	Yes			

		used for import to the area.	Question 1.5 and will be consider at the next stage					
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Yes	However, who determines 'appropriate' use? EA can comment on recycling. Penultimate bullet point not understood RE-presumption against landfill.	Comments noted, the objectives have been drafted to promote the efficient use of resources	No	Second bullet point appeal contrary to the long-term availability for future generations. Greater emphasis on recycling needed.	The second bullet point seeks to ensure an adequate and steady supply of primary and secondary minerals in order to meet the need of current and future generations.		
Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes			Yes				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)	YF have no comments							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Yes			Yes				
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	Minerals development does not take place in it		Minerals can only be worked where they occur, The	The final bullet point of the Minerals Core		Comment noted		

	would cause irreparable harm to irreplaceable environmental assets. Direct minerals developments away from those areas of environmental importance.		spatial planning system seek to identify the most sustainable locations for mineral extraction through an iterative process utilising Sustainability Appraisals and Appropriate Assessments.	Policy should be amended to read....."ensuring that the needs for minerals is met in a manner which safeguards the distinctive natural and historic assets of ERY and H and the quality of life of its communities".				
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	No	We do not agree that the objectives are appropriate for Joint Minerals DPD. The objectives do not include protection of other natural resource relating to best and most versatile agricultural land.	The fourth bullet point seek to protect the environment and local communities from the effect of mineral operations. The aim of the LDF is to avoid repeating National Policy, which affords protection of heritage and countryside including the best and most versatile land.	Additional bullet should be added relating to directing mineral development to areas where least harm and minimum impact on the environmental and communities whilst protecting sites/species		Comment noted		
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)	Yes			Yes	No other questions answered, Comment made:- If Goole is to have 36000 extra	Comment noted		

					<p> dwellings (2000 each year over 18 years) and more employment opportunities there be a need to improve local passenger rail services, e.g. and Goole to Leeds line for both work and leisure opportunities to minimise the need for road traffic.</p>			
<p> Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)</p>	<p> They have not answered the questionnaire, however there is a detailed comments on the Plan document. They state that they are in general agreement with the plan</p>			<p> State they are in general agreement with the plan</p>		<p> Comment noted</p>		
<p> Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)</p>	<p> Did not answer questionnaire but attached 'consultation response' outlining objections, and a plan indicating Potential Coal Bed Methane</p>		<p> The comment are noted and will be consider at the next stage of the document</p>	<p> They are general disagreement with the plan</p>		<p> Comment noted</p>		

	Opportunity areas.							
Respondent 13-QPA	bullet point should be split to address each point separately firstly to define mineral safeguard areas to prevent needless sterilisation of mineral resources and secondly to safeguard rail heads, wharfage and assoc. storage handling and processing facilities. there is no mention of making provision to meet sub regional apportionment. the bullet should be reworded to say' to maintain an adequate and steady supply of minerals to meet sub-regional apportionment allocated to East Riding and the required landbank during and at the end of the plan		The comment are noted and will be consider at the next stage of the document					

	period in accordance with national policy;							
Respondent 14 - RSPB	No	The last objective should be amended to state "using strategic planning of nature as an after use"	Comment noted					
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority	N/C							
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly	GENERAL COMMENTS							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No	Page 16 BP starting... to ensure that mineral sites are restored.... This core strategy should require restoration to a biodiversity after use. It is important that in the original planning app. The restoration of the site is considered. This should be seen in a landscape context rather than a individual site. the offshore dredging bullet should include reference to	Comment noted if biodiversity is to be made a priority then national policy suggests this should be achieved through the appropriate policies.					

		protection of the marine environment.						
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	No	agree with most of the principle objectives, but would propose a further objective stating that promote good husbandry of environmental resources during the development' with regard to the 6th principle the wording is not clear and wholly unsustainable. many mineral sites are reliant on the importation of selected materials to achieve restoration scheme of beneficial use. and outright presumption against landfilling would compromise many restoration schemes effecting the sustainable use of the resultant landform in the future propose modified wording to ensure that mineral	Comment noted with regards bullet point 6.					

		sites are restored to the highest standard of beneficial after use.						
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways	See AOB sheet.							
Respondent 23 - GOYH								
Respondent 24 - EON	No	The principal objectives should reflect more closely the national objectives for mineral planning. Taking into account the governments energy policy and incorporating the development of underground storage of natural gas.	The comments have been noted and will be taken forward					
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	No	Too many subjective comments e.g. 'environmental aims'.	The Minerals DPD provide the framework for					

		The objectives should be the supply of aggregates and needs.	mineral planning in the plan area. In line with national guidance the objective seek to provide a clear statement on all issue which extend beyond supply issues and include environmental protection and sustainability,					
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water								

Issue 1 Questions 1.1 to 1.6								
	1.1 Are there any specific mineral resources which you consider warrant safeguarding and why?	Comment	Response		1.2 What Approach should be taken to safeguarding of Mineral Resources? (Options A,B,C,D or E)	Comment	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes	Sand and Gravel reserves in and around the North Cave area. This is an important resource which has supplied this and adjoining areas for over 30yrs. Oolitic limestone reserves banded by the Wolds escarpment to East. This is a largely untapped resource which might fill the gap between	Comments noted		D	E, Safe guarding policy would need to be tailored to a particular mineral resource.	Comments noted	

		high quality limestones imported from West and North Yorkshire and the relatively soft local chalk. Clay - certain areas produce clay with specialist applications.						
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	Yes	Chalk aquifer is very important and must be protected.	European and National Legislation provides overarching protection to aquifers. The DPD includes objective and development control policy which are formulated to protect the environment.		D			
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Yes	Imports through ABP Hull (Deep Water) and through rail heads	Comments noted			See comment for 1.1	Comments noted	
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt,	Yes	High grade chalk and silica	Comments noted		C	C with the presumption in	Comments noted	

Turley Associates)		sand should be safeguarded from development that will prevent future extraction. Both are imported to greater extent then should occur.				favour of all sand products as well as existing permitted reserves. Geology will be the deciding factor.			
Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes	All minerals need safeguarding, but where recycled aggregate can be used, it should be. Local authorities should be specifying recycled products where possible.	Comments noted		D				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)									
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Yes	Safeguard high grade chalk deposits in the vicinity of queen case	Comments noted		D				

		quarry, Beverley. Also, consider safeguarding any other, known high grade chalk deposits within the plan area.						
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	Safeguard quarries which are considered to have potential to provide material for the repair of historic buildings. English heritage have commissioned research of such locations that will be available next year.		Comments noted		Option D would appear to be most appropriate. However there needs to be some refinement in order to exclude areas which are never likely to come forward for minerals development.		Comments noted	
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	No				C			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis)								

on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA	No comment				D			
Respondent 14 - RSPB	Yes	Safeguarding minerals can serve a dual purpose of safeguarding the resource for future use and enabling long term planning for the delivery of biodiversity through nature as an after use.	Comments noted		C	If safeguarding zones are also used as a means of long term planning of nature as an after use, then clay extraction on the areas around Broomfleet brick clay pits creates potential to deliver reedbed habitats. More reedbeds are needed to support the long-term viability of bitterns (one of the SPA listed species).		
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority	Yes	Coal is an important energy mineral which should be included in the DPD. MPS1 states that there should be the "...aim to	Comments noted		E	Safeguard all mineral resources that have the potential to be of economic value in the future, which would allow the opportunity to prevent unnecessary	Comments noted	

		<p>source mineral supplies indigenously, to avoid exporting potential environmental damage, whilst recognising the primary role that market conditions play; ..." Energy White paper "...Government believes that these factors reflect a value in maintaining access to economically recoverable reserves of coal..."</p>				sterilisation of coal resources in particular.			
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly									
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust					E	Page 21 Para 4.19 there is no relevant question relating to this paragraph our comment would be we would not support the extraction of			

					increased levels of marine aggregate in order to reduce extraction on land as such extraction can have very serious but less obvious effects on the marine environment			
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes, No comment made				D			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH	D	RSS policy ENV4A identifies -Sand Gravel chalk, Clay and Peat to be safeguarded	Comments noted		D			

		with appropriate landbanks.							
Respondent 24 - EON									
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	Yes	Minerals that make the EY and Hull market self sufficient.	Comments noted		D				
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water									

Issue 1 Questions 1.1 to 1.6									
	1.3 Should resources be safeguarded where they fall within areas which are covered by the national and international landscape and nature conservation designations?	Response			1.4 In addition to a mineral resource being safeguarded, should an additional 'buffer zone' be identified to prevent development which may constrain the working of a resource? If so, how far should buffer zones extend?	Response			
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes, if limited resource falls within these areas, its value in future may compromise the value of the area it lies within. In other areas there may be the same resource abundantly available in less sensitive areas. Each resource in sensitive area needs to be judged on its own merits.	Comments noted			Yes, say 0.5km. Individual examples need to be judged on their own merits.	Comment noted			

Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	Is it safeguard the resource despite conservation designation, or conserve the site against mineral working? It should be the latter.	Comments noted		No buffer zone needed. In any case it is unlikely in E. Yorkshire, other development pressures will control use of buffer zones.	Comment noted			
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	No			Yes, 1 mile	Comment noted			
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Only if they are high grade sand and chalk.	Comments noted		Welsh consultation is looking at 500m for open cast coal. HSE is looking at 150m for hazardous installations.	Comments noted			
Respondent 5 - un-id	These areas can often benefit from mineral workings as long as they are designed from the out set and restored to high standards.	Comments noted		To allow the operation to be sustainable.	Comments noted			
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Yes, Geology will not vary but boundaries and policies associated with national/ international designations may change within out with the plan.	Comments noted		Yes. The extent of a buffer zone should be considered on a site by the site basis (but, could consider 100m as rule of thumb)	Comments noted			
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)								
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	No resources should not be safeguarded where they fall within national, and international designations. MPS 1 Para 9 and 14 PPS9 buffer zones should also be set around these designations.	Comments noted		N/C				

Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA	MSA's should be defined in national and international designations even if there is a presumption against major mineral development does not mean that under appropriate conditions development should not be permitted. Reference should be made to MPS1 paragraph 14	Comments noted		Yes a buffer zone should be identified around MSA however the width of the buffer zone is dependent on individual site.	Comments noted			
Respondent 14 - RSPB	no resources should be safeguarded within areas of nature conservation designation unless there is a national need that cannot be satisfied through other sites which are less damaging. From the perspective of long term planning of nature as an after use in safeguarding zones account should be taken of the requirements for species and	MSA prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral, they are not a presumption for mineral working.		It is difficult to set a buffer that would be applicable for all types of resource it is better dealt with at site level.	Comments noted			

	habitats within designated sites.							
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority				Buffer zones would ensure that economically viable coal is worked in the most efficient way	Comments noted			
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Strongly object to extraction of mineral resources where this would have a -negative impact on areas covered by national and international designations. The plan needs to id priority habitat suggest identifying local wildlife sites and opportunities for buffering/ linking	Comments noted						
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	For landscape designations yes, as extraction is a temp activity, for ecological resources no, for SAC, SPA's etc however proposals near SSSI should not necessarily be discounted due to ever evolving translocation strategies.	Comments noted		With regard to the buffer zone this should be applicable to all forms of mineral development as it will lead to the least impact on local residents in particular. Especially hard rock working defined on a site by site basis	Comments noted			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21-								

South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH	We expect government policy to be met	Comment noted		We would not support the generic use of local buffer zones under govt policy.	Comments noted			
Respondent 24 - EON								
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	Minerals by nature usually fall into areas of 'conservation' therefore this should not be a issue.	Comments noted		Of this exercise is remains about mineral buffer zones should not be introduced.	Comments noted			
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water								

Issue 1 Questions 1.1 to 1.6								
	1.5 What approach should be taken to the safeguarding of facilities for the transportation of minerals by rail and water? (Options A,B.C or D)	Response		1.6 What approach should be taken to the safeguarding of facilities for the processing of minerals and manufacture of mineral based products? (Options A or B)	Response			
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates &	B (It must be desirable to take some mineral transportation off the roads)	Comment noted		B				

Excavations limited)								
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	B			B				
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Should only be needed to safeguard facilities currently in use.	Comment noted		B				
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	C, Maintain the ability, where economically viable, for such facilities to carry minerals.	Comment noted		B				
Respondent 5 - un-id	C			B				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Safe guard those facilities which may have a proven economic viability in the foreseeable future.	Comment noted		Not all associated facilities for processing minerals need to be safeguarded - some facilities may become economically unviable and if safeguarded may prove to be detrimental to certain landscapes; become isolated and safety liabilities i.e. impact on ecosystems, etc. therefore, safeguard those which have economic future in foreseeable future.	Comments noted			
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)								

Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	C help reduce material movement by road reduce CO2 emissions	Comment noted			A. minimum disruption				
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)									
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)									
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)									
Respondent 13- QPA	C				B				
Respondent 14 - RSPB	C. Plan should look at safeguarding potential future routes for minerals transportation that seek to reduce carbon emissions as part of the Region's climate change mitigation				N/A				
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority									
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly									
Response 17-					B				

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust								
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals				B				
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways	C The government are actively encouraging greater use of inland waterways for the movement of aggregates	Comment noted						
Respondent 23 - GOYH	all possible facilities for transport of minerals by rail and water should be safeguarded to minimise the transport impact. Safeguarding does not establish a presumption for granting planning permission.	Comments noted		B - Govt policy for waste and minerals endorses increased plan support for identifying/safeguarding suitable processing facilities				
Respondent 24 - EON								
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	The proximity principle should be a prime consideration.	Comments noted		C, processing should be done where most convenient.	Comments noted			

Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water									
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Issue 2 – Efficient Use of Mineral Resources									
Question 2.1 to 2.2									
	2.1 How should the efficient use of mineral resources be promoted in the JMDPD? (options A,B or C)	Comment	Response	2.2 Can you suggest other measures for increasing the efficiency of mineral working?	Response				
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	B	Construction industry guilty of over specification creating consumption of high quality aggregates unnecessarily.	Comments noted	Avoid over specification. Avoid importation. With large developments encourage use of locally available aggregates.	Comments noted				
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	A	Option B, is ideal but doubtful there is a real method of implantation. Also Option B relates back to 4.30 on viability of supplies/ suppliers. The relationship of Planners to supplier viability is	Comments noted	Use minerals for their most advantageous use e.g. by strict specification/control in use at the design stage.	Comments noted				

		dangerous.						
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	A							
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	B	What is appropriate? Who determines it?	Comments noted					
Respondent 5 - un-id	B							
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	B			Through monitoring and enforcement of pursued development schemes/plans by MPA's.	Comments noted			
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	B	High quality minerals should not be wasted on activities that do not require them. They should not be wasted in supplying needs that can be adequately met using low grade minerals. Consequently support option B.	Comments noted					
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	B							
Respondent 10								

- (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA	B			N/C				
Respondent 14 - RSPB	B			N/C				
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority								
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	B							
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 -	A							

Fenstone Minerals								
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH	B	There is a strong support through MPS1 for promoting more efficient use of minerals as part of delivering Sustainable Development strategy						
Respondent 24 - EON								
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	A			When considering land banks the sub-division of course and fine should be included	Comments noted			
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water								

Issue 3 – Supply of Aggregates					
Question 3.1					
		Comment	Response		
	3.1 What level of aggregate sand and gravel supply should the Minerals DPD aim to achieve for the plan period? (Options A,B or C)				
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	A	These are government indicators and are difficult for mineral operators to judge. Its tempting to suggest land bank reduction to enable more easily gained planning permissions.	A reduction in landbank below the calculated levels will encourage secondary and recyclable aggregates to meet the shortfall this will generate in terms of supply. However, this will be dependant on appropriate policy to promote recyclable aggregates. On the other hand, a reduction in landbank below the calculated levels will fall below the calculated annual apportionment based on National and Regional policy.		
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	B	Simple target try for 50% of present. To prevent reckless use and encourage re-cycling.	Calculated annual apportionment in Table 3 are slightly below the reported sales figures for 2001-2006, but in line with national and regional policy. This trend aims to encourage and support recycling		

			which can be used to meet shortfall in terms of demand and supply. By lowering the level proposed by the sub-regional apportionments to a level lower than 50%, with increasing demand and annual sales, there will need to be a proportional increase in other areas to enable resources meet higher demand needs for increasing trend.		
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	C	The policy needs to include for imports as this is currently taking place.	Comment noted.		
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	A	N/A	N/A		
Respondent 5 - un-id	A	N/A	N/A		
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)	A				
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)					
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	The 2004 RAWP Report noted a urgent need for a study to assess the likely environmental impacts of additional sand and gravel extraction. This was also noted in the RSS for the region, current work investigating environmental constraints may well indicate that the figures are undeliverable without causing significant damage to the East riding of Hull.		Comment noted. Study proposed to assess environmental impacts. Outcome of study will influence policy to be adopted.		
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	A	Each sub region needs to be self sufficient in supplying aggregates to meet their own	Comment noted		

		requirements hence reducing the need to transport materials over long distances outside the sub region.			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)					
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)					
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)					
Respondent 13- QPA	C	This question needs to address shortfall in landbank for crushed rock paragraph 4.46 should be re-worded approaching the minimum landbank of 7 years and further permissions are required in order to maintain supplies, and the landbank for crushed rock is already well below the minimum level of 10 years.	MPS1 states: "Landbank indicators are at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock". Para 4.46 is stated in accordance with government MPS1.		
Respondent 14 - RSPB	N/C				
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority					
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly					

Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	B				
Respondent 18 - PCT					
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	A				
Respondent 20 Environment Agency					
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council					
Respondent 22 - British Waterways					
Respondent 23 - GOYH	A	Reflects RSS, meets MPS1 and PMS6, has the right sub regional apportionment figures and clearly identifies the need to increase landbanks			
Respondent 24 - EON					
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	A				
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water					

Issue 4 – Identifying Locations for Mineral Extraction						
Questions 4.1 to 4.6						
	4.1 Do you agree with the approach to identifying Preferred Areas that was used in the JMLP?	Comment	Response	4.2 Are there any other considerations that you think should be taken into account?	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes	Operators are able to identify mineral resources of economic viability. They usually continuously prospect to ensure their own business sustainability	Comments noted			
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	Yes	Proliferation of sites and associated nuisance from quarries is undesirable.	The identification of site/ preferred areas give greater certainty of future sustainable mineral working.	Preferred areas enable community planning and give hope of end to nuisance.	Comment noted	
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Yes			Proximity to roads, houses, access (not to pass sensitive areas such as schools)	Comments noted	
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Yes	Adds some certainty to both operators and the public.	Comment noted			

Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes	N/A		N/A				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Yes							
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	Subject to the additional considerations detailed below, we would broadly support an approach along the lines used in the JMLP to identified Preferred areas.			Along with the national policy guidance the process used in the JMLP should also consider the following:- 1. affects of mineral extraction on historic assets of area. 2.Impact development may have on views of registered parks and gardens. 3.Impact on register battlefields. 4.Impact on landscape and historic areas identified.	Comments noted			
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	N/c			N/C				
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 -								

(CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA	N/C			N/C				
Respondent 14 - RSPB	No	Recommend the inclusion of SAC and SINC as a local designation. Best and most versatile agricultural land should not be excluded in use for minerals in areas where there is potential to deliver nature as an after use. This type of habitat creation enables long term management for SPA designated species.	Comment noted	These areas should have consideration for the potential to adversely affect designated sites even outside the boundary. The areas should consider the potential to link up existing areas of habitat through nature as an after use.	The Appropriate Assessment will consider the suitability of site/ areas with respect to International Designations.			
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority								
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								

Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No	Environmental constraints should be extended to including local wildlife sites mineral extraction in these areas could be very damaging.	Comment noted	Buffer zones will be required around designated sites to avoid disturbance this would need to be determined at planning permission stage.	Comment noted			
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes							
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH								
Respondent 24 - EON								
Respondent	Yes			employment in the countryside	Comment noted			

(Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Yes	New safeguarding areas will need to be considered when identifying new areas of search for mineral site replacement within/ out with the plan period.	Comment noted				
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)		Subject to additional considerations detailed below, we would broadly support an approach along the lines used in the JMLP to identify Areas of Search.	Comment noted	In line with the advice given in the national policy guidance, the process used in the JMLP should also consider the following:- 1.Affects extraction has on historic assets of an area. 2. Affects developments may have on key views from parks and gardens. 3. Impact on registered battlefields 4. Impact upon the landscapes and historic areas identified in policies.	Comment noted		
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	N/C			N/C			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of							

Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA	N/C			N/C			
Respondent 14 - RSPB	No	as 4.1	Comment noted	see 4.1	Comment noted		
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority							
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No	Environmental constraints should be extended to inc local wildlife sites mineral extraction in these areas could be very damaging.	Comment noted	Buffer zones will be required around designated sites to avoid disturbance this would need to be determined at planning permission stage.	Comment noted		
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes						
Respondent 20 Environment Agency							
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH							

Respondent 24 - EON							
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	Yes						
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

Issue 4 – Identifying Locations for Mineral Extraction							
Questions 4.1 to 4.6							
	4.5 In identifying Preferred Areas and Areas of Search, do you think it is appropriate to: (Options A,B or C)	Response	4.6 What approach should the Minerals DPD follow in relation to environmental and cultural assets when identifying locations for new resources or providing policy guidance from new and existing sites? (Options A,B,C and D)	Comment	Response		
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	A , However new quarries will always be necessary.	Comment noted	C	Our latest application were for the creation of an existing nature reserves extension by the extraction of sand and gravel. This is preferable to extracting sand and gravel, and trying to find a use afterwards.	Comment noted		
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	Choice between A or B would be most attractive - but not entirely practical.	Comment noted	B	D is a good option if fully comprehensive but is open to abuse/ option at local level.	Comment noted		
Respondent 3 -	C, This is the only way	Comment noted	C				

Cory Brothers	to achieve investment in new sites.						
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	C, One extension site may not be better than a new site simply because it is already connected to a historic quarry. Minerals development is supposed to be a temporary use of land.	Comment noted	A				
Respondent 5 - un-id	A		C				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	C, circumstances change - flexibility is required to ensure that options are available.	Comment noted	C	some proposed sites may fail to be identified or noticed forward as a result of potential impacts - all issues should be considered to ensure imposed sites are 'deliverable' within the plan period.	Comment noted		
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	Given the considerable environmental assets of the area, it would be preferable to treat each site on its merits.	Comment noted	It is important that the DPD set out a robust strategy for ensuring that the demand for minerals is met in a manner which safeguards this resource (wealth of historic assets).		Comment noted		
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	C. performs best in SA. The DPD should have clear criteria based	Comment noted	all options have some merit consideration should be given to all 4 in combination.		Comment noted		

	policy to assess the most suitable site location which takes into account Landscape, Biodiversity, International, National and designated sites and species, access to sustainable means of transport, best and more versatile land and access and recreation activities in the area.		Alternatively option D appears to be favoured in the SA.				
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA	C no particular priorities should be give to either extensions or new sites each should be assessed on their own merits.	Comment noted	C				
Respondent 14 - RSPB	A		D	this option enables the planners to take into account areas of habitat	Comment noted		

				which may be restored. The goal of achieving a net gain in environmental quality supports the role of the minerals dev plan to strategically plan nature as an after use.			
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority							
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Every site will be unique in terms of habitat, species, and proximity to areas important for nature conservation. Each one should be considered separately.	Comment noted	D	Restoration of mineral extraction sites can frequently provide gains for biodiversity and greatly enhance the area. Environmental gains should be part a vital part of the development plan.	Comment noted		
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	C assessment should be against sustainability objectives	Comment noted	A				
Respondent 20 Environment Agency	environmental impacts are usually considered to be lesser for extended existing works rather than starting new sites. However sensitive areas should including	Comment noted					

	source protection zones and would discourage works in such areas as there is a risk to drinking water supplies						
Respondent 21 - South Cave Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH	C. Historically, priority has tended to be given to extending existing quarries to minimise overall impacts. Option C enables a focus on existing sites.		A	As it is government policy	Comment noted		
Respondent 24 - EON							
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	A and B would hinder this project C must be the only option.	Comment noted	C	This is too subjective to be a real consideration & only when the development is brought forward can it be addressed	Comment noted		
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

**Issue 5 – Imported Aggregates
Question 5.1 to 5.6**

	5.1 Do you think that the present policy for marine aggregates landing and handling development should be reviewed in order to provide more capacity for importing marine aggregates?	Comment	Response	5.2 Should potential sites for marine aggregates landing and handling development be identified and safeguarded?	Comment	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes	Presumably within Hull Docks which needs regeneration	Comment noted	No	Hull Docks must be most suitable site.	Comment noted	
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	No opinion	Effectively this is with DEFRA/ economics of the extraction process.	Comment noted	No	None in E.Yorks.	Comment noted	
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Yes	But not limit to marine other aggregate are imported.	Comment noted	Yes	Need deep water quay.	Comment noted	
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Yes	If there is demand and wharf capacity.	Comment noted	Yes			

Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes	Only if we cannot sustain development of our minerals.	Comment noted	Yes	As above.	Comment noted	
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)							
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)							
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	N/C			N/C			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA	N/C				potential for marine aggregate landing and handling development should be identified	Comment noted	
Respondent 14 - RSPB	No	Strategic planning would avoid conflict with	Comment noted	Yes	as 5.1 priority should be given to retaining existing	Comment noted	

		the Development zone, potential flood risk issues and adverse effects on the Humber Estuary and would enable adequate transport planning.			port infrastructure rather than creating new infrastructure that could adversely effect the Humber.		
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority							
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No	Very damaging to the marine environmental. Effects on local fishing, etc expanding extraction could have detrimental effects	The expansion of extraction activities and the assessment on its environmental effects remains in the remit of DEFRA.	No	would not support the expansion of marine extraction.	Comment noted	
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency							
Respondent 21- South Cave							

Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 24 - EON							
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	No			No			
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

Issue 5 – Imported Aggregates							
Question 5.1 to 5.6							
	5.3 Should there be a presumption in favour of safeguarded sites be granted planning permission, subject to meeting defined planning and environment criteria?	Comment	Response	5.4 Do you think that the present policy for rail depots suitable for importing aggregates should be reviewed in order to provide positively for more capacity?	Comment	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations	Yes	Surely always the case.	Comment noted	Yes	Given that local deliveries are always by road it must be	Comment noted	

limited)					desirable to import by other means where possible.		
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	No	Safeguarded sites are mineral sites other than conservation ones					
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Yes			Yes	Greater competition may stimulate the market.	Comment noted	
Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes			Yes	I have worked with rail depots in the past and what they do is give you large capacity deliveries without having a large impact i.e.. People noticing large volumes being moved.	Comment noted	
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)							
Respondent 8 - (English							

Heritage)							
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	Yes			Yes	The movement of materials by rail should be encouraged to reduce CO2 emission created by road transport.	Comment noted	
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA	N/C			N/C			
Respondent 14 - RSPB	yes	If the site has a significant effect on the Humber Estuary SPA/cSAC, an appropriate assessment will be required under Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c) Regulations	Comment noted	N/C			

		1994					
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority							
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	No	Individual sites should be looked at time of planning application, wildlife situation may change overtime	Comment noted	-			
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency							
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH	Yes	Option C It seems an omission that RSS has not looked at safeguarding	Comment noted				

		marine handling facilities and we agree this should be reviewed and sites safeguarded. on presumptions is not acceptable					
Respondent 24 - EON							
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	Yes	Common sense says that existing sites are fulfilling a need	Comment noted	No			
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

Issue 5 – Imported Aggregates							
Question 5.1 to 5.6							
	5.5 Should potential sites for rail depots be identified and safe guarded?	Comment	Response	5.6 should there be a presumption in favour of safeguarded rail depot sites being granted planning permission, subject to meeting defined planning and environmental criteria?	Comment	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Yes	However, this is difficult as most potential sites are already	Comment noted	Yes	Surely always the case	Comment noted	

		exploited. A new rail depot is a rare occurrence.					
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton				No			
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 5 - un-id	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)							
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)							
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of							

Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA	Potential sites for rail depots should be identified and safeguarded			N/C			
Respondent 14 - RSPB	N/C			N/C			
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority							
Respondent 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	-			See 5.3		Comment noted	
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	Yes			Yes			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency							
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH							
Respondent 24 - EON							

Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	No			No			
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

Issue 6 – Non Aggregate Minerals								
	6.1 What approach should be taken to the supply of clay for brick and tile making? (Options A,B or C)	Comment	Response	6.2 What approach should be taken to supply industrial chalk? (Option A or B)	Comment	Response	6.3 What approach should be taken to the future control of peat workings? (Option A or B)	Response
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	B	Large investment for factory production is required. Long life by large resources is vital to encourage long term commitment.	Comment noted. National & Regional policies support and encourage policies to encourage Investment decisions and safeguard long term commitment.	A			A	
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	A			A	See Q 3.3 targets			
Respondent 3 -	A			A			A	

Cory Brothers								
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	B?	Option B with a longer life. Investment in the brick works need a longer payback then 25 yrs. See Stevens report 1976- 60 yrs which is the period for review consent	Comment noted	A			Protect Peat from any other further working. There is significant composted material form green waste to meet the demands of the peat users.	Comment noted
Respondent 5 - un-id	A			A			A	
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)				A				
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)	Option B may help to provide a degree of certainty both for minerals operators and the local community and would ensure that all the potential options for meetings the		Comment noted	It would be helpful for the plan to identify either Areas of Search or Preferred areas for chalk in order to provide a degree of certainty for both the mineral	Comment noted. National and Regional policies support identifying Preferred areas.		As Paragraph 4.74 notes, in terms of historic environment, there are considerable archaeological remains within the peat deposits at Goole Moor. Consequently,	Comment noted. National and Regional policies support the permission for archaeological interest in exceptional circumstances, where it can be demonstrated conclusively

	25 year supply of clay are examined at a strategic level.			operators and the local community.			we favour option A.	that extraction will not adversely affect habitat species or deposits being safeguarded.
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	B						A, The DPD should recognise that the changes in extraction of peat is continued and the potential for the peat lands to store and be used as a carbon sink should be supported.	Comment noted. National and Regional policies support and encourage environmental potentials.
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite								

Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA								
Respondent 14 - RSPB	B			N/C			B the policy should be amended so that there are no exceptions to further working of Peat; No further working of peat outside the area already with planning permission'	Comment noted. National and Regional policies support restrictions to further workings outside such areas.
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority								
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust							A	
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	B			the use of processed chalk enables both industry	Comment noted			

Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)								
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)								
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	A, as it continues to protect Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar? Proposed SAC	Comment noted	N/A		A			
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA								
Respondent 14 - RSPB	A							
Respondent 15	The changing	Comment			A			

- Coal Authority	energy markets and economic values of coal would suggest that a flexible approach should be used to allow for potential new mining opportunities between now and 2026. The Coal Authority would wish to ensure that there was sufficient flexibility through criteria based policies to facilitate appropriate future proposals.	noted						
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	B coal mined for power stations has great CO ² implications the plan should consider restricting coal mining for Power stations.	MPG 3 suggest that while indigenous reserves are available and power companies chose to use the mineral the UK coal contributes to						

		energy diversity and supply. Emerging government energy policy recognises charges in the energy market and the potential damage of CO2 but indicates that coal will still play a role in the future energy supply.						
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals								
Respondent 20 Environment Agency								
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 -								

British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH								
Respondent 24 - EON					A with amended policy as follows "Gas Storage facilities will be permitted in coastal areas provided that (1)they are in the national interest. (2)Environmental assessments demonstrate no likelihood of significant adverse effects on the environment. (3)Proposals have no significant adverse effect on highway safety. (4)there are no long term implications for coastal defence.	Comments noted and will be consider at the next stage.		
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company	A		N/A		B, encourage as strongly as possible.	Comment noted		
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water								

Issue 7 – Energy Minerals
Question 7.1 to 7.6

		Response		Response		Response
	7.4 If option B is favoured, what do you consider the key features to any new policy approach should be?		7.5 What approach should be taken to the possibility of proposals for the underground gas storage development coming forward during the plan period?		7.6 If option B is favoured, what do you consider the key features of any new policy approach should be?	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	N/A		A			
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	N/A		A			
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	N/A		Not on questionnaire			
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	N/A		B		The national strategy in relation to energy supply, form the energy white paper (May 07) 'Meeting the energy challenge' satisfies the need argument. New policy should concentrate on spatial and environmental impacts.	Comments noted

Respondent 5 - un-id	N/A		Not on questionnaire				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)							
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)							
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	N/A		A		N/A		
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)							
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)							
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)							
Respondent 13- QPA							
Respondent 14 - RSPB							
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority			A				
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly							

Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust							
Respondent 18 - PCT							
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals							
Respondent 20 Environment Agency							
Respondent 21- South Cave Parish Council							
Respondent 22 - British Waterways							
Respondent 23 - GOYH							
Respondent 24 - EON							
Respondent 25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company			Not on questionnaire.				
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water							

Issue 8 - Development Control and the Protection of Local Communities and Natural Resources							
Question 8.1 to 8.6							
	8.1 How should Minerals DPD approach development control policies for the protection of natural resources? (Option A or B)	Response	8.2 If option B is favoured, what considerations or initiatives should feature in Minerals DPD?	Response	8.3 What approach should the Minerals DPD take to protecting the interests of local communities? (Option A or B).	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberstone Aggregates & Excavations limited)	A		N/A		B		
Respondent 2 - H B Heaton	B		Option B is effectively option A plus Local aspects. But it also includes specific unique needs for minerals from the area.	Comment noted	B		
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	A		N/A		B		
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	A		N/A		B		
Respondent 5	B		Long term benefits,	Comments	B		

- un-id			habitat, wildlife, leisure facilities.	noted				
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)								
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	B		There is a need to consider those natural resources which may be impacted upon within the local area. Any specific or locally unique issues are not considered to be described/ incorporated into local policy.	Comment noted.	B			
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)								
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	B		A new policy should take into account the issues that are specific to the plan area and these should include:- Wildlife Sites/ biodiversity and Geological Conservation, Landscape Character/ Quality, Coastal areas, Public Rights of way/ access to the countryside/ countryside recreation.	National and regional policies require local policies to consider carefully the protection of heritage and countryside as it affects mineral	B			

				proposals with the view of maintaining the integrity and importance of sites of bio/geo diversity, landscape, historical and cultural heritage.				
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA	A		A					
Respondent 14 - RSPB	B		the plan process should take account of regional habitat	Comment noted. National	B			

			network maps, local biodiversity action plan, landscape scale habitat restoration projects. Habitats and species of designated sites to assist with prioritisation of habitats created as after use. Plan process should enable link with green infrastructure planning.	and regional policies support the requirement for this.				
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority								
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust					B			
Respondent 18 - PCT	B the question refers to developing a strategy for the protection of existing natural resources. Are all resources identified, if not then there needs to be some	Comment noted. National and regional policies support the identification and protection of heritage and						

	activity to ensure that natural resources are appropriately identified.	countryside in relation to mineral resources.						
Respondent 19 - Fenstone Minerals	B		B if A was implemented it would only lead to the implementation of generic DC policies that would not specifically relate to the local environs or mineral workings of the joint area therefore B is preferable.	Comment noted.	A			
Respondent 20 Environment Agency	B Develop a strategy for the protection and enhancement of natural resources		Sequential tests of allocation sites to be considered	Comment noted.	B			
Respondent 21 - South Cave Parish Council								
Respondent 22 - British Waterways								
Respondent 23 - GOYH								
Respondent 24 - EON								
Respondent			This is a no-win	Comment	B			

25 - Sandsfield Gravel Company			question for minerals operations & should be excluded	noted.				
Respondent 26 - Yorkshire Water								

Issue 8 - Development Control and the Protection of Local Communities and Natural Resources								
Question 8.1 to 8.6								
	8.4 If Option B is favoured, what benefits do you suggest should be pursued?	Response	8.5 How should the management and restoration of mineral sites be addressed? (Option A or B)	Comment	Response	8.6 For Option B, which environmental benefits do you feel should be given priority?	Response	
Respondent 1 - (Humberside Aggregates & Excavations limited)	Usually possible to provide some form of community benefit or amenity within a detail restoration plan e.g. nature conservation, fishing, nature trails, countryside walks etc.	Comment noted. National and regional policy support the provision of community benefit.	A	Local authorities usually tie the operator to a detailed restoration plan as a condition of the planning permission. Public exhibitions at the planning application stage give the public chance to comment or suggest.	Comment noted.	N/A		
Respondent 2	Each	Comment	A	It is almost	Comment	Noise, dust, smell,	Comment noted.	

- H B Heaton	community is almost unique, and 'quality of life' for each is subjective, but improvement of quality has to be the target.	Noted. Same as above		impossible to meet option B - there are too many factors which are site specific.	noted	heavy traffic, no damage to existing agriculture, etc.	National and regional policies will apply.	
Respondent 3 - Cory Brothers	Roads - minimise haulage	Comment noted. National and regional policies encourage bulk transportation by rail, sea or inland waterways as far as is practicable and to reduce environmental impact of their transportation.	A			N/A		
Respondent 4 - (Richard Hunt, Turley Associates)	Access to restored land - public ownership? Absolute highways safety as a consequence of mineral extraction.	Comment noted.	A	Every site has different challenges and benefits. Policies that are too loose or too tight constrain and prevent development.	Comment noted.	N/A		

Respondent 5 - un-id	Find out what would benefit them at local planning stage.	Comment noted	A			N/A	
Respondent 6 - (Yorkshire Forward)							
Respondent 7 - (Gary Staddon Imerys)	Encourage periodic liaison meetings with the local community where there are public concerns regarding sites operations.	Comment noted. National and Regional policies support and encourage liaison.	B	Although site specific issues will influence the overall restoration scheme of a mineral working there is often a benefit to using a spatial regeneration scheme for mineral working within an area to ensure, where ever possible an appropriate scheme after use is proposed.	Comment noted	This can only be answered following a 'capacity' survey/assessment to identify what are the most appropriate restoration options for the area and specific site.	Comment noted.
Respondent 8 - (English Heritage)							
Respondent 9 - (Natural England)	access and recreation, local nature conservation facilities, safeguard	Comment noted.	B			biodiversity habitats, green infrastructure benefit recreation flood alleviation, soil restoration to	Comment noted. National and Regional policy guidelines will apply.

	communities from noise, dust and traffic movements					previously grade quality.		
Respondent 10 - (Mr. Graham Hulme)								
Respondent 11- (East Yorkshire RIGS Group)								
Respondent 12 - (CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Composite Energy)								
Respondent 13- QPA			A					
Respondent 14 - RSPB	development of nature as an after use improves access to the countryside the framework provides a strategic link into the rights of way network.	Comment noted.	B	addressing management and restoration on a site by site basis leads to a piecemeal approach limiting benefits for the environmental and communities. Need an overall framework help deliver biodiversity	Comment noted	Long term management for habitats and species assoc with Thorne and crowle moors Humber lower Derwent valley and enabling adaptation to climate change.	Comment noted.	

				targets.				
Respondent 15 - Coal Authority								
Respond 16 - Yorkshire and Humber Assembly								
Response 17- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	B planning obligations should be used to ensure that the site is passed over to a competent manager after agreed aftercare period to maximise community benefit. The wildlife trust would be happy to work with the MPA and developers to deliver long term benefits.	Comment noted.	B	restoration of sites should be set within a biodiversity framework	Comment noted	inc biodiversity local community provision	Comment noted.	
Respondent 18 - PCT								
Respondent 19 -			A					

