

<b>Minerals</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Respondee</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>LCC Initial Response and links</b>	<b>Action</b>
001	Martin Clayton:Geo Plan Ltd	Marshalls Natural Stone	<p>Market forces will determine how long Howley Park Quarry will remain in operation for.</p> <p>Safeguarding is to protect viable mineral resources for future generations, not just for the duration of a development plan document. The justification for not safeguarding potential crushed rock resources is therefore flawed.</p> <p>Safeguard potential resources between the existing Howley Park quarry and the M62 against inappropriate development that might otherwise sterilise them.</p>	<p>The DPD will continue to safeguard the quarry until the brick clay has either run out or is no longer needed. This is because it is better to use the existing quarries to meet need rather than to open new ones.</p> <p>Agree need to consider.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Consider if this area should be a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA).</p>
022	Ian Smith	English Heritage	<p>Midgley Farm, Otley – There is a Grade II Listed Building immediately to the south of this area – proposals need to accord with national policy.</p> <p>Sand and gravel resources in north Leeds area are located in attractive landscape areas and within the area are some important historic assets therefore support the identification and production of the Wharfe Valley.</p> <p>We broadly support the approach set out for the protection of potential sources of building and roofing stone which reflects the advice in Annex3 of MPS1.</p> <p>Need to safeguard quarries which are currently being worked (and their possible extensions) and former quarries which have the potential to be reopened to supply material for the repair and restoration of historic</p>	<p>Midgley Farm is a long-standing allocation in the UDP, any planning application will be assessed against stringent environmental criteria.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Agree important quarries for this purpose should be</p>	<p>DPD to include environmental criteria to reflect the requirements of the current UDP Saved Policies.</p> <p>Liaise with EH and</p>

			<p>structures and buildings within the area. (MPS1 Annex 3 para 3.3)</p> <p>English Heritage and LGYH have commenced work on a project which will identify important historic quarries within the region.</p> <p>Policy Position Statement should make reference to other important sources identified as part of the emerging Regional Strategic Stone Study.</p>	safeguarded.	LGYH once the findings of the study are available, to see if any further safeguarding needed and incorporate relevant data for Leeds into the DPD.
028	David Brewer	Director General of the confederation of UK Coal Producers (CoalPro)	<p>Paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19 and Preferred Policy Position 5 are incorrect and do not accord with national policy guidance as set out in MPS1 and MPG3.</p> <p>The statement in the first sentence of 3.18 is incomplete and one can only conclude that this is deliberately the case to the point of being disingenuous. The presumption against opencast coal mining can be set aside if the proposal is environmentally acceptable or can be made so by the use of planning conditions or obligations. There is therefore a clear onus on the MPA to work with the applicant to determine what reasonable planning conditions or obligations can be used to make the proposal environmentally acceptable if it is adjudged not to be so initially.</p> <p>Furthermore, if (and only if) the proposal is not, or cannot be made, environmentally acceptable, then community benefits should be taken into account. These principles apply even in the Green Belt or other sensitive areas provided the proposal meets the highest environmental standards. The statement in the first sentence of para 3.18 should therefore be amended to reflect the above.</p> <p>para 3.18. It is simply not the case that the further exploitation of fossil fuels is counter to the main principles. Whilst ever UK coal demand exceeds indigenous supply, which is likely to be the case for years to come, then production of coal in the UK, including from within Leeds, is not simply a relatively low carbon option, but <u>THE</u> lowest carbon option of the available alternatives. The only alternatives is imports with the consequent carbon emissions associated with transport. Using imports</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Review our approach to MSAs and include MSA for coal.</p> <p>Suggest a carefully re-worded statement – eg the shallow coalfield</p>

		<p>as opposed to indigenous sources is contrary to MPS1 and is simply the antithesis of sustainability.</p> <p>The statement in the third sentence of para 3.18 that coal cannot be ruled out in the immediate future as an energy source is a massive and crude understatement of the situation. At present coal provides about a third of the country's electricity and at times in winter, this proportion increases to half, not least in this present cold winter. Without coal, the entire electricity generating and supply system would completely break down with all the consequences that that entails. Whilst coal burn will gradually reduce over the next few years it will remain an essential component of the UK's electricity generating system, not least to provide essential back up for intermittent and unreliable renewable sources, for many years to come and probably permanently. The sentence needs completely rewriting to reflect the situation as it stands and not pure fantasy.</p> <p>Para 3.19 is simply unacceptable and is directly contrary to minerals planning guidance. There remain significant resources of shallow coal in Leeds and extraction opportunities other than at development sites remain. Such opportunities are, or can be made, fully compliant with MPS1 and MPG3. The shallow coalfield is not fragmented and it is wrong to state that it is untenable for the Council to identify MSAs for coal. This is contrary to guidance in MPS1 which <u>requires</u> MPAs to identify MSAs. Greater Manchester has been able to identify such areas and there is no reason whatsoever why Leeds should not also be able to comply with national guidance.</p> <p>The MPAs need not, and should not exclude the built up area. Indeed, the statement in para 3.19 that coal might be extracted prior to development applies equally to redevelopment within built up areas and there are many such examples nationally. Indeed, how can such opportunities be assured if the MSAs do not extend to cover such areas? The paragraph should be completely rewritten to reflect guidance in MPS1 and MPAs should be established for coal. As a consequence, the Preferred Policy Position should be completely rewritten. The extraction of coal should be catered for and the principles set out in MPG3, as described above, should be applied. MSAs should be identified for coal, as required by MPS1, and including</p>	<p>LCC accepts that our approach to MSAs need to be reviewed and that we need to identify an MSA for shallow coal.</p>	<p>itself is not fragmented but the opportunities for extraction are limited within built up areas and outside those areas other constraints apply.</p> <p>Review our approach to MSAs and include MSA for coal.</p> <p>Review our approach to MSAs and include MSA for shallow coal. Appropriate mapping to show the extent of the MSA to be provided.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>the built up area and all Green Belt land. A map of the MSAs for coal should be drawn up.</p> <p>Para 3.20 should refer to the potential for producing fireclay in conjunction with coal. Fireclay is a nationally important resource for high quality buff-coloured bricks and is in short supply. It can, generally, only be produced economically in conjunction with surface-mined coal. Reference should be made to this in Preferred Policy Position 6.</p> <p>Para 3.26 and the Preferred Policy Position should make it clear backfilling with overburden arising from the mineral extraction process itself is favoured. It is necessary to distinguish this from backfilling with landfill waste.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Backfill does normally mean overburden.</p>	<p>Include reference to fireclay.</p> <p>Clarify in the text that the backfill should be with overburden rather than landfill waste.</p>
032	Ben Ayres	Hanson UK	<p><b>Safeguard existing mineral-related sites:</b></p> <p><b><u>Asphalt Plant at Hunslet (Off Bridgewater Road) &amp; Possible Aggregates &amp; Asphalt &amp; Concrete Railhead Complex (DPD document ref No 22).</u></b></p> <p>Object to the existing site not being safeguarded. Plans to expand current business at the site or alternative - Neville Hill. Plans in preparation with landlord (DB Schenker)</p> <p>In order to safeguard its asphalt facility and maintain continuity of supply to its customers will either develop the existing site into a rail head facility incorporating an Asphalt plant, aggregates handling facility and concrete manufacturing plant or to relocate to provide this development at an alternative site.</p> <p><u>Provision should therefore be made in the Natural Resources and Waste DPD -Policy Position Report for possible expansion at Hunslet or relocation of the facility to Neville Hill.</u></p>	<p>This site is a housing allocation in the UDP. However, as yet it has not come forward. LCC needs to consider if the housing allocation is still appropriate in this industrial area. There is a need to protect and enhance Leeds' role as a regional employment centre and this site is more suited to meeting employment needs than it is for meeting housing demand. There are other areas of the City which are more suitable for housing.</p>	<p>Either safeguard the existing asphalt plant off Bridgewater Road (site ref. 22) or try to find an alternative site that can also be accessed via rail.</p>

			<p><b><u>Concrete Plant at Cross Green Way, Cross green industrial Estate (DPD document ref No 27).</u></b> We support this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Concrete Plant at Knowsthorpe Road ,Cross green industrial Estate (DPD document ref No 31).</u></b> We support this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Mineral reserves should be safeguarded Brickworks at Swillington (DPD document ref No 4).</u></b> We support this proposal.</p>	<p>Given the desire of the existing occupant to expand operations in the Leeds area and the importance of the nature of their business to the asphalt and concreting industries and also the fact that the facility can be serviced by rail rather than road, it is recommended that Leeds safeguards site ref. 22 and replaces the UDP housing allocation with an employment allocation.</p> <p>Supports welcomed.</p>	
	Hanson UK continued	<p><b><u>Brickworks at Howley Park Quarry &amp; Brickworks (DPD document ref No 5).</u></b> We support this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Sand &amp; gravel allocation at Midgley Farm, Nr Oltey (DPD document ref No 39).</u></b> We support this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Sustainable Mineral Site Management .</u></b> <b><u>An Example of a successful partnership developed between the Developer, the planning authority and the local community:</u></b> Otley (Bridge End) Quarry restoration scheme and ongoing partnership with the Oltey Wetland Nature reserve trust.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>Proceed with safeguarding of existing site.</p> <p>Proceed with allocation.</p> <p>Suggest could use this example in the DPD with photos to illustrate.</p>	

			<p><b><u>Industrial estates that have been identified as appropriate for waste and mineral uses</u></b></p> <p>Provision needs to be made available for B2 uses such as the manufacture of concrete in North Leeds (i.e. in Bramhope, Otley, Yeadon, Guisley). Hanson has an ongoing need for a replacement concrete plant site (1 acre plot-B2 use) for its Otley Concrete Plant (now closed) in the North Leeds Area.</p> <p>LCC would not extend existing planning permission at Otley – no other suitable alternative industrial sites in Otley or surroundings. Hanson sought permission to secure a possible site at Blackhill Quarry at Bramhope (DPD document ref No 1) which was refused by Leeds CC.</p> <p>Relocating the concrete production into the quarry area would reduce the visual impact of the Plant. Allocation of land for B2 uses required in North Leeds unless planning policy changes to allow the use of existing quarry sites for such processes – seek to promote use of land within Blackhill quarry as a location for a concrete plant.</p> <p>Alternatively consider increasing existing industrial areas like Milners Road, Guisley, or for example bring forward new industrial land in the Otley area as part of or prior to any long term relief road proposal at Otley.</p>	<p>The industrial nature of a concrete batching operation means that it can be difficult to find suitable locations for it. For this reason it is preferable to support existing operations where they are running without objection, rather than allocating new sites.</p> <p>The Otley site is in the Green Belt and the Blackhill Quarry site is not an appropriate location as the stone there is not suitable for concrete and therefore it would have to be brought in.</p>	
036	Dr Kevin Grady	Leeds Civic Trust	<p>(Mineral 9a/b) while the aspiration for more sensitive after use of mineral sites is welcomed, there can be positive benefits from accommodating the landfill which will remain an element in the overall waste management strategy. Limited landfill can provide funding for the enhancement of sites which would otherwise develop in an inappropriate way and or lead to safety concerns from unauthorised use. Supports longer term restoration periods.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	
037	Les Morris	National Grid	<p>Draws attention to the presence of overhead cables and gas pipelines</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	

			within specific sites and the need to consult with them prior to determination of any planning applications.		
038	Malcolm Ratcliffe	Mineral Products Association	<p>In <u>paragraphs 3.1 and 3.9</u> the text refers to '<i>regional targets for aggregates...production</i>'. Nowhere in MPS1 or in the RSS is the term used of mineral production.</p> <p>The sub regional apportionment (which is not a target production level or a maximum production ceiling) is expressed as a total tonnage over the indicative period. This can be averaged out by dividing by the numbers of years in the period and such a yearly figure will be used to calculate the landbank.</p> <p>Amend text to reflect this and suggest the phrase could be substituted by reference to 'sub regional apportionment'.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 3.3</u> refers to 'excessive importation' of aggregates. We are not sure what you mean by this. The West Yorkshire sub region has probably always been a net importer of aggregates and there is nothing unusual about large urban areas being so. Imports might only be described as excessive if the mpas were not observing their responsibilities to provide for local aggregates production.</p> <p><u>Paragraphs 3.6, 3.7 and 3.10</u> and the ensuing <u>Preferred Policy Positions 1 and 2</u> on mineral safeguarding Areas and Sites are entirely inadequate. The BGS report '<i>A Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England</i>' published in 2007 seeks to provide advice which facilitates the implementation of national policy set out in MPS1 paragraphs 10 and 13.</p> <p>The text appears to misunderstand the application of the BGS recommendations about mineral safeguarding and confuses mineral resources with reserves. In this respect we would direct you to the IMM Reporting Code which defines the differences between mineral resources and reserves.</p> <p>The text indicates that safeguarding is only intended for permitted</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>Agree that it would be useful to have a sub-regional apportionment.</p> <p>Agree need to be clear about mineral movements.</p> <p>Agree need to re-assess our approach to MSAs and have clear definitions of what we mean by an MSA and a resource and a reserve. It would be helpful to set these out in the DPD.</p> <p>Agree this needs explaining more clearly. Intention is to</p>	<p>Re-work reasoned justification to use accepted terminology.</p> <p>Leeds intends to establish an on-going dialogue with other Authorities in the LCR to work towards establishing sub-regional apportionments.</p> <p>Mineral movements to be clearly set out in a background Minerals evidence report.</p> <p>Provide definitions in DPD.</p>

			<p>reserves ('existing mineral sites') which is contrary to the intention of the BGS guidance to safeguard all mineral resources of economic importance.</p> <p>An area like Leeds with constrained sand and gravel resources will need to include identification within landscape designations and urban areas. Other minerals may need a modified approach in view of the extent of the resource but the Council should include all minerals that are of economic importance. This should include sandstone and limestone resources. The Council should carry out a consultation exercise with the industry to refine the areas of mineral deposits that need to be safeguarded, not for the plan period but for the longer term. It would then be open for the Mapbook sites to be included within that Safeguarding Area as identified sites of proven mineral reserves and provision for mineral related activities.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 3.9</u> indicates the current uncertainty over the sub regional apportionment which is under review. The correct approach will be to proceed with the LDF on the basis of the current sub regional apportionment set out in Table 10.1 of the RSS until such time as this is changed. It would be good practice in our view, for the Council to make contingency plans for a higher apportionment should this become a reality.</p> <p>Disappointed the Council is not willing to address the severe shortfall in sand and gravel provision. The results of the 2008 AM survey (set out in the 2009 RAWP report) indicates that at the end of 2008 there was a one year landbank for sand and gravel in West Yorkshire and only one operating pit, in Leeds, which has limited remaining reserves. Whilst the Council has identified one site for future sand and gravel production in Leeds this will, according to the UDP Review 2006 para 5.5.41, add 1.6 mt to the landbank, or 4.7 years (1.6/0.34mt). We understand that the timeframe for the DPD is for 15 years, in which case there is a substantial shortfall in identified provision, which the DPD appears not to address.</p> <p>MPS1 paragraph 15 advises that local authorities should, "<i>identify sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search, having taken account of environmental considerations, to provide greater certainty of where</i></p>	<p>safeguard existing sites and also to draw up MSAs.</p> <p>Agree but clarify with GOYH what plan period we are planning for.</p> <p>This is a regional issue and needs a consensus at regional level.</p> <p>Leeds has identified two sites for sand and gravel not one.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>Review our approach to MSAs and consult with minerals industry.</p> <p>Consult GOYH whether need to plan until 2026 or beyond.</p> <p>Seek consensus on sub-regional apportionment for sand and gravel.</p> <p>Identify specific sites, preferred areas and areas of search as</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---



		<p><i>future sustainable mineral working will take place;</i>” This is backed up by guidance in the MPS1 Practice Guide which further advises of the importance of identifying Specific Sites or Preferred Areas. Areas of Search are to be reserved for circumstances “<i>where knowledge of mineral resources may be less certain...</i>” (para 41), which is not the case in Leeds where the sand and gravel resources are well known. Paragraph 42 is particularly relevant. This says, “<i>It is not generally appropriate to identify only areas of search in a LDD because these provide less certainty of where development might take place. MPAs that choose this approach must fully justify it in their LDDs. In most cases sufficient specific sites and/or preferred areas should be identified, so that on adoption of a LDD, there is adequate provision to cover the LDD, if sufficient acceptable sites are known at that stage.</i>”</p> <p>Urge the Council to carry out call for sites to meet the expected shortfall in sand and gravel provision, and not to rely on Areas of Search or criteria based policies, which do not accord with national policy and best practice guidance.</p> <p>We find the <u>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 7</u> confusing in that although recycling is mentioned in the tile, it does not feature in the text box. This should be remedied.</p> <p>Once potential for recycling has been exhausted for residual C&amp;D waste and other inert wastes, there remains a need for landfill which can be accommodated in mineral excavations. Urge Council to recognise this in order to reduce the distance travelled by waste residues to final disposal and to improve quarry restoration. However, we also support the broad objective of encouraging biodiversity.</p> <p>Accordingly, we also support <u>Preferred Policy Position – Waste 4: Providing Self Sufficiency for C&amp;DE Waste</u> as far as it goes, but would observe that self sufficiency involves providing for the disposal to landfill of residues after recycling. In view of our comments on the continued need to landfill inert waste residues, we cannot support the Council’s <u>Preferred Policy Position – Waste 11: Landfill Disposal</u> which advocates a presumption against new landfill provision within the LCC</p>	<p>A call for sites is not necessary as LCC already knows where the sand and gravel is.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Leeds has sufficient holes in the ground to meet need during the plan period and well beyond.</p> <p>Leeds has sufficient holes in the ground to meet need during the plan period and well beyond.</p>	<p>necessary to meet the apportionment once it has been agreed.</p> <p>Add ‘minerals recycling’ to the policy.</p> <p>Provide evidence of landfill capacity in the background evidence report.</p> <p>Provide evidence of landfill capacity in the background evidence report</p>
--	--	---	---	---

			area.		
044	Gerald J F Heward	Wood Hall and Heward Ltd	<p>Supports safeguarding of wharves.</p> <p>“ We are pleased to see the wharf at Old Mill Lane, Hunslet on the list. This is owned by British Waterways and a working wharf here would support BWs efforts to increase freight transport on BWs canals.</p> <p>Add BW owned land at Skelton Grange Road should be added to the list. The wharf area could have good road access to Pontefract Road.</p> <p>Include Total Oil wharf on the list – can be used in conjunction with the Cross Green users for both incoming and outgoing goods.</p> <p>Reinstate Hanson Cross Green asphalt plant site (document reference no 22) and Bridgewater road, Cross Green (document reference no 186) on the list.</p> <p>Add Skelton Grange Wharf to list in view of the proposals in Map E that the Power Station site be a strategic waste site. Whilst we can see that original waste would largely arrive by road from various parts of the city, there will be scope to take recyclates (e.g. scrap metal, glass etc) away by barge. In view of their proximity to the Navigation, we support the proposals that the Stocks and Bison sites in Stourton be earmarked for waste and aggregate recycling.</p>	Comments as above for response to Hansons.	Add possible wharves to list of safeguarded sites.
045	Rachel Wiggington	GOYH	<p>PPM1 The Inspector’s comments on MSAs and proposed extraction areas are supported. Separate policies are needed for extraction areas.</p> <p>PPPM3 The Wharfe Valley should be considered as a potential MSA to be shown on the Proposals Map. You will also need to be able to justify a policy that appears to presume against further extraction.</p>	Leeds intends to re-assess it’s approach to MSAs. New MSAs will be re-drawn in line with MPS1. There is a wide variety of interpretation of what is an MSA and	Review our approach to MSAs and consult with minerals industry and GOYH.

			<p>PPPM4 Show workable resources as MSAs on the Proposals Map and the expansion sites as proposed extraction areas.</p> <p>Para. 3.18-19 We note that there is a presumption against opencast coal mining in MPG3 but this does not preclude indicating safeguarding areas. The policy should reflect guidance in MPS1 and MPG3, including in relation to the Green Belt and is only needed if it adds to national guidance.</p> <p>MPG3 para. 37 lists criteria and refers to broad areas of search or indication of the shallow coalfield/constraints or a combination of these. The policy should also refer to other energy minerals, including coal methane.</p> <p>PPPM9a There is still a need to address landfill of residual waste, since there will still remain a (reduced) requirement this. There will be some need for landfill capacity which might be accommodated in minerals sites.</p> <p>Para. 3.30 All the saved minerals policies should be replaced in this DPD, if they are still appropriate, or otherwise deleted.</p>	<p>Leeds intends to set out its definition of what this means.</p> <p>Leeds has no data on coal methane.</p> <p>Leeds has sufficient landfill capacity to meet the need for this and other wastes during the plan period.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Review Saved UDP Policies, integrate into DPD where appropriate.</p>
046	Angela Flowers	North Yorkshire County Council	<p>PPM2 – safeguarding at 2 specific sites is a limited approach to safeguarding of aggregate resources within Leeds. The BGS report: A Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England (BGS 2007) - mineral safeguarding areas are areas of known minerals resources that are of sufficient economic or conservation value to warrant protection for generations to come.</p> <p>In response to para 3.8 industry reps consider Wharfe valley to contain a large and good quality sand and gravel resource. Wharfe Valley is unviable for new quarry development due to landscape/envirom designations and strong local opposition (BGS report West Yorkshire sand and gravel resources: Investigating the potential for an increased sub-regional apportionment (2009).</p>	<p>Clarify our approach to safeguarding existing sites and providing MSAs along with clear definitions.</p> <p>Agree need to weigh landscape quality and public views with need for sand and gravel. For a large population the Wharfe Valley is the closest thing people</p>	<p>Review MSAs and re-consult with minerals industry and GOYH.</p>

			<p>Set out a more comprehensive approach to the safeguarding of aggregate resources to prevent further sterilisation of good quality resources does not occur and to ensure their long term availability. This could be in the form of more widely defined safeguarding areas, based on resource considerations rather than existing production units.</p> <p>Potential for alternative approach to apportionment still exists. A review of the approach is a requirement of current RSS policy. Whilst limited, there may be some potential for increase of sand and gravel apportionment for West Yorkshire.</p> <p>Currently sand and gravel supplied to the Leeds-Bradford area is transported over long distances. The sustainability of such an approach is questionable in terms of transportation impacts.</p> <p>Landbanks of aggregate in North Yorkshire have been declining in recent years (sand and gravel in particular) and growing pressures and constraints on production from within North Yorkshire may have an impact on the longer term ability of North Yorkshire to continue to supply the West Yorkshire area.</p> <p>Council should set out a more positive policy approach to both the safeguarding and the provision of future supply of sand and gravel in particular. Without this a more sustainable approach to sand and gravel supply within the Region is unlikely to be delivered.</p>	<p>have to a quality landscape. Leeds is able to meet some of the need for sand and gravel but cannot meet all of it.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Leeds is able to meet some of the need for sand and gravel but cannot meet all of it.</p>	<p>Review MSAs.</p>
048	Heaton Planning	D Green, UK Coal Ltd	<p>National Policy does not restrict development within GB, important landscapes, areas of nature conservation, biodiversity or on agricultural land so neither should NRWDPD. Minerals can only be worked where they are found. It is down to the individual operations to be able to provide adequate mitigation measures and sensitive working practices to allow such developments to proceed with minimal effect.</p>	<p>Mineral extraction must be balanced alongside other planning factors which lead to quality of life for a large urban population.</p>	

			<p>Need to demonstrate why tools such as landscape character cannot be used.</p> <p>Para 1.10, page 3, sets out the expanded Vision for the DPD – we would recommend the inclusion of safeguarding and avoidance of sterilisation of natural resources (as recommended within para 13 of MPS1) within this section and this should be re-enforced within the Key Objectives of the NRWDPD.</p> <p>Preferred Policy Position – Land 3: Urban Tree Planting. This position is appropriate and is supported.</p> <p><b>Safeguarding Approach</b> Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 1: Safeguarded Mineral Sites. This is NOT the correct approach to be taking in safeguarding the Authority’s mineral resource. See Planning and Minerals Practice Guide, Nov 2006, Para 32 and Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS): the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, Policy ENV4: Minerals.</p> <p>Minerals resources should be protected from sterilisation irrespective of the size of the resource.</p> <p>Acknowledge resource of coal is small but still important to protect in long term. There is no presumption that resources safeguarded through MSAs or MCAs will actually be worked for minerals</p> <p>Recommend that mineral safeguarded areas should be expanded to cover the whole of the authority’s mineral resource. See Nottinghamshire County Council policies which provide a clear steer on constraints.</p> <p><b>Restoration</b> Preferred Policy Position – Mineral 9a and Mineral 9b The Preferred Approaches for restoration seem appropriate; we would state that the restoration of some sites can benefit from the landfilling of waste.</p>	<p>A Landscape Character Assessment was carried out and used to define SLAs in the UDP. Same study supports the DPD.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Leeds intends to review it’s approach and new MSAs will be re-drawn and we will then re-consult with the minerals industry and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>	<p>Include safeguarding and avoidance of sterilisation of natural resources in the Vision and in the Key Objectives.</p> <p>Review and re-consult on MSAs.</p> <p>Review Saved UDP</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Para 3.30 states the following Saved Policies are relevant, it is not clear whether these are proposed to be retained for the NRWDPD: N45, N46, N46A, N46B, N48B, EM9, GM4</p> <p>Concern regarding the resistance of extraction within Special Landscape Protection Areas, the retention of Policy EM9 and over the approach being taken for Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</p> <p><b><u>COAL AND ENERGY</u></b></p> <p>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 5: Coal Need to be explicit that there is only a presumption against coal extraction if it does not meet the <u>tests</u> as set out in MPG3, para 8. All development needs to ensure environmental impacts are acceptable and if not that other factors may override such unacceptable impacts. See decision by the Secretary of State for a UK Coal application at Huntington Lane, Telford for the extraction of coal by surface mine methods. The SoS decision and Inspector's report reiterate the tests within MPG3.</p> <p>There is not clear evidence how the future extraction of indigenous coal resources is counter to the NRWDPD's main principles. The NRWDPD should have clear regard to the aims of the Government's White Paper on Energy: Meeting the Energy Challenge, May 2007. This document analyses the long-term energy challenge the UK faces.</p> <p>Refer to The UK Government published 'The Energy Challenge: Energy Review Report' (Cm 6887) in July 2006. UK will become importers of oil and gas therefore need to secure reliable energy supplies to prevent risk to the nation's energy security. Need to make best use of existing reserves including coal. Decline in coal production can be reversed if surface mine output is maintained at recent levels balanced against environmental impacts and community needs.</p> <p>Within the Leeds Authority area there are identifiable coal reserves that, despite the assertion of the NRWDPD that they are 'very</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>Mineral extraction must be balanced alongside other planning factors which lead to quality of life for a large urban population.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Leeds will define an</p>	<p>policies, integrate into DPD where appropriate.</p> <p>Review our approach to MSAs.</p> <p>Revise Policy Position wording in the Publication draft document.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>fragmented', are capable of being mined by surface working methods and these should be safeguarded. More sustainable to use own reserves rather than importing. The national planning guidance provided within MPG3 is outdated; there is a clear shift in the Government's position on supporting the extraction of indigenous coal.</p> <p>Para 6.1 There are no clear mechanisms in place for ensuring delivery of renewable and low-carbon energy generation in the NRWDP over the plan period therefore it must be accepted that there will continue to be a reliance on energy supplied by fossil fuel power stations. In turn the NRWDPD should be more positive in securing an indigenous supply of coal.</p>	<p>MSA for coal but this will not mean that extraction will be supported.</p> <p>The LDF is required to demonstrate how we intend to encourage greater provision of renewable energy, this obligation does not exist for coal.</p>	<p>Define an appropriate MSA for coal.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

055	Colin Holme	Natural England	<p>Natural England welcomes '<b>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals Safeguarding Areas – Building Stone</b>' and its emphasis on protecting resources for local minerals extraction. Utilising local stone can facilitate design consistent with landscape character. However, future development of minerals extraction should only be undertaken where environmental constraints can satisfactorily be resolved. Effects on landscape character, biodiversity, access and the sustainable use of soils will all need to be considered.</p> <p>Natural England would make the following comments in relation to the sites considered in the minerals safeguarding policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any operations developed at <b>Minerals Safeguarding Area 37</b> should ensure that appropriate measures are taken to safeguard the interest of the nearby UK Biodiversity Action Plan deciduous woodland, viewpoints from the Leeds Country Way and the nearby Eccup Reservoir SSSI;</li> <li>- Any operations developed at <b>Minerals Safeguarding Area 35</b> should ensure that appropriate measures are taken to safeguard the interest of the nearby Mickleton Ings SSSI.</li> <li>- Any operations developed at <b>Minerals Safeguarding Area 40</b> should ensure that appropriate measures are taken to safeguard the interest of the nearby UK Biodiversity Action Plan deciduous woodland.</li> </ul> <p>Natural England agree with '<b>Preferred Policy Position 9a: Restoration of Minerals Sites</b>'. We would like to see linkages made to the achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan objectives and the enhancement of ecological networks, particularly within the region's Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (see: <a href="http://www.yhbf.org/articledetail.aspx?page=AC83E0DC-F9A8-4918-9AD9-FB62C4D8596C&amp;article=1BF625A1-A1FF-4649-B1E5-CB758CA5469D">http://www.yhbf.org/articledetail.aspx?page=AC83E0DC-F9A8-4918-9AD9-FB62C4D8596C&amp;article=1BF625A1-A1FF-4649-B1E5-CB758CA5469D</a> ). We would be happy to work with Leeds when proposals for restoration are developed. Further support for this policy could be achieved through, for example, a minerals SPD or detail in the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>Natural England welcome '<b>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 9B: Restored Site Management</b>', which allows for longer periods of aftercare to accommodate restoration for nature conservation.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Points noted on individual sites. Any impacts on SSSIs will be considered if and when applications come forward.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Offer welcomed.</p>	<p>Reinforce links with achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan objectives.</p>
056	Sam Thistlethwaite	Banks Developments	<p><b>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 5: Coal</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19 and Preferred Policy Position 5 do not accord with national policy guidance as set out in Mineral Planning Statement 1 and Mineral Planning Guidance 3.</p>		





			<p>opportunities be assured if the MSAs do not extend to cover such areas? The paragraph should be completely rewritten to reflect guidance in MPS1 and MPAs should be established for coal.</p> <p>As a consequence, the Preferred Policy Position should be completely rewritten. The extraction of coal should be catered for and the principles set out in MPG3, as described above, should be applied. MSAs should be identified for coal, as required by MPS1, and including the built up area and all Green Belt land. A map of the MSAs for coal should be drawn up.</p> <p><b>Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 6: Brick Clay</b></p> <p>Para 3.20 should refer to the potential for producing fireclay in conjunction with coal. Fireclay is a nationally important resource. It can, generally, only be produced economically in conjunction with surface-mined coal. Reference should be made to this in Preferred Policy Position 6.</p>	Agree	Include reference to fireclay in the draft Publication document.
058	Mary Keynes	Impact Residents Network	Supports protection of mineral resources through safeguarding areas and alternative uses for restoration.	Support welcomed.	
061	Stuart Beardwell	Leeds Friends of the Earth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5) Agree with protecting mineral resources but also depends on the site and appropriateness of retaining for future use. This approach doesn't take into account the need to reduce demand and exploitation of natural resources and minerals and look to reusing and recycling materials.</li> <li>• 7) If we are effectively moving waste up the waste hierarchy, there should be less demand for landfill area and therefore alternative uses for exhausted quarries will need to be sought.</li> </ul>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>	
063	Matt Naylor	Yorkshire Water	<p><b>Mineral Safeguarded Areas</b></p> <p>Yorkshire Water has apparatus crossing three sites identified as safeguarded sites and owns land within a fourth.</p> <p><b>LPA Ref: L010</b> <b>YW Ref: LD0007</b></p>	Site specific comments noted and will be taken into account when or if a planning application is received.	

			<p><b>Site Address: Howley Park Quarry, Morley</b> A trunk water main is recorded to cross the site. YW has reached an agreement with the quarry operator with respect to this pipe.</p> <p><b>LPA Ref: L012</b> <b>YW Ref: LD0008</b> <b>Site Address: Britannia Quarry, Morley</b> There is a 525mm surface water sewer crossing the site. This sewer will require the necessary protection from future quarrying activity.</p> <p><b>LPA Ref: L005</b> <b>YW Ref: LD0013</b> <b>Site Address: Moor Top Quarry, Guiseley</b> The safeguarded mineral site includes an area of essential operational land under the ownership of Yorkshire Water. This land will probably be required in our next capital investment plan (2010-2015) for a new service reservoir to ensure security of the public water supply network across Leeds. Therefore the land will be unsuitable for quarrying.</p> <p><b>LPA Ref: L012A</b> <b>YW Ref: LD0017</b> <b>Site Address: Britannia Quarry Extension, Morley</b> There is a 525mm surface water sewer crossing the site. This sewer will require the necessary protection from future quarrying activity.</p>		
065	Mr. Zulfiqar Ali	Environment Agency Y&H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals 7: Minerals Recycling and Reuse sites</li> </ul> <p>We support the provision of minerals recycling sites as being key in reducing the amount of Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste which is currently landfilled.</p>	Support welcomed.	
068	Mike Willison	Leeds Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites.</li> </ul>	Supports welcomed.	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports finding alternative uses for quarries. Any development of safeguarded areas or extensions of safeguarded sites should seek, where appropriate, to maintain and enhance the public right of way network.</li> <li>• Opportunities should be sought on restoration to enhance the rights of way network by adding new paths and the retention of any diverted paths. The LLAF supports the examples cited in the Policy.</li> </ul>	Consider opportunities for requiring this when incorporating the Saved UDP policies.	Review Saved Policy and incorporate policy wording into the DPD as appropriate.
71	David Berry	The Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation No.1 Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 5: Coal Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy. Objection – The Coal Authority welcomes the recognition within paragraph 3.18 that fossil fuels including coal cannot be excluded as an important energy source in the future.  The Coal Authority objects to preferred policy position which does not identify Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) for coal.  Whilst most respondents to the earlier consultation did not wish to see any encouragement for further coal mining the definition of MSAs does not indicate a presumption that the resources contained within them will be worked (MPS1, para. 13). This is reiterated by the BGS 'Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England' It is unreasonable for the Council to attach any weight to this argument as part of the justification for its proposed approach.  Furthermore, the Surface Coal Resource Plan, which the Coal Authority provided to Leeds City Council in December 2009, shows the surface coal resource area to be a coherent feature present across much of the southern part of the Council's administrative area. It does not therefore represent a fragmented resource which would be untenable to safeguard, as suggested in</li> </ul>	Comments noted.	Review our approach to MSAs and map MSA for coal then consult with mineral operators.

			<p>paragraph 3.19 of the consultation document.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal to assess any future planning applications for coal extraction on their merit is welcomed, the Coal Authority is of the opinion that the Council's overall proposed approach to coal is not based on a robust or credible evidence base and does not take full account of the need for, or purpose of, MSAs.</p> <p>The BGS Guide states that MSAs do not preclude other forms of development but ensures that mineral resources are adequately and effectively considered in land-use planning decisions.</p> <p>The Coal Authority's Surface Coal Resource Plan has been developed in conjunction with British Geological Survey and surface mining operators specifically for use within the planning process. It represents the best available geological and minerals resource information for the area, as required by paragraph 32 of the MPS1 Practice Guide, and therefore demonstrates the existence of proven and economically viable coal resources for planning purposes. When combined with the evidence outlined above, which demonstrates that there will be a continued demand for coal over the DPD period, the Coal Authority is of the opinion that there is a clear justification for safeguarding coal through the definition of an MSA covering the surface coal resource area. This should be supported by the inclusion of appropriate policy criteria to avoid the unnecessary sterilisation of resources within the MSA, which should include encouraging the prior extraction of coal, where practicable, if it is necessary for non-minerals development to take place within the MSA. The example policy set out on page 10 of the BGS Safeguarding Guide may be helpful for this purpose.</p> <p>This approach will ensure that the presence of surface coal resources is a material consideration of planning applications for non-minerals development within the MSA. It would not indicate any presumption that the areas within the MSA would be</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Review our approach to MSAs and map MSA for coal then consult with mineral operators</p>
--	--	--	---	------------------------	---

			<p>appropriate for coal extraction, or that other forms of development would automatically be precluded within the MSA.</p> <p>As outlined above, the Coal Authority would welcome the inclusion of an appropriate policy setting out the criteria against which any application for coal extraction could be assessed. However, whilst this should be included within the DPD, it should not be viewed as a replacement for the definition of an MSA for coal as this is necessary in order to ensure consistency with the guidance in MPS1.</p> <p>Reason – To ensure the DPD is consistent with the guidance in MPS1 (Planning &amp; Minerals).</p>		
075	Nicola Bell of Scott Wilson (agent)	PPL Revera	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the need to protect mineral resource and the need to find alternative uses for restored quarries. Support is given to safeguarding existing mineral, sand and gravel and building stone sites as set out in Preferred Policy Positions 1, 2 and 4.</li> <li>Object to safeguarding mineral –related sites in general industrial areas.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that it would be difficult to identify mineral safeguarding areas for coal, it is reinforced that the Leeds district has significant resources of un-worked coal and its exploitation should not be prevented simply because it is not identified spatially.</p> <p>The wording of Preferred Policy Position – Minerals 5: Coal is supported, as it allows for planning applications for coal mining to be judged on their individual merit.</p>	<p>Supports welcomed.</p> <p>It is necessary to safeguard to ensure that the need for such activities can be met.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Review our approach to an MSA for coal and re-consult with relevant stakeholders.</p>
076	Jon Crossley	Micklefield PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites.</li> <li>Supports finding alternative uses for quarries.</li> <li>The eastern red line boundary of the protected mineral (limestone) extraction site at Bragdale is rather inopportune. It rigidly following a 50m separation from the nearby watercourse, the red line intrudes into Weet Wood and thereby intrudes into the Special</li> </ul>	<p>Supports welcomed.</p> <p>An MSA does not mean that consent will be granted for extraction. Boundaries for MSA</p>	<p>Clarify whether this an allocated site or an MSA. If it is an</p>

			Landscape Area. It is surely in everybody's interest (not least the smoothest possible adoption of this LDF) for the red line to be revised to skirt the edge of the woodland. Why raise the potential for formal objection to either tree loss (if the area is quarried) or harm to the SLA, for no good reason? Please revise the red line to exclude Weet Wood from the proposed protected site for mineral extraction.	should follow the line of the resource. Boundaries for an allocated site should exclude Weet Wood.	allocated site then the boundary should exclude Weet Wood.
080	Dan Walker, David L Walker Ltd.(agent)	David Atkinson, Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>• Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites.</li> <li>• Only supports finding alternative uses for quarries where necessary or appropriate, however it should be recognised that restoration of sites can be enhanced by the importation of materials. Safeguarded areas need to be shown on proposals map.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PPPM2 need more detailed contributions on landbank/provisions to allow for considered opinion.</li> <li>• PPPM5-9b: further detailing and definitions needed.</li> </ul>	Supports welcomed.  Leeds is struggling to fill all its landfill sites and therefore needs to encourage alternative uses. Agree to review MSAs and map as appropriate. Need consensus on sub-regional apportionment. Agree	Provide further landfill data in background evidence report.  Review MSAs.  LCC working on this with adjoining MPAs.
086	Lionel Sykes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q5: we need to protect our mineral resources, but if they are required for use, what is the answer?</li> <li>• Q6: The question can only be answered by LCC Planning Department.</li> <li>• Q7: Once a quarry has had all it's minerals extracted, it is only suitable for landfill.</li> </ul>	DPD proposes the answer and seeks comments from public.  There are numerous examples of other after-use.	None.
088	Mike Harty	Biffa Waste Services Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>• Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites.</li> <li>• Do not support finding alternative uses for quarries as PPPM9a states there is still need for landfill sites.</li> </ul>	Support welcomed.  Leeds is struggling to fill all its landfill sites and therefore needs to encourage alternative uses.	None.  Provide further landfill data in background evidence report.

091	FM Lister (Trustees)	Henry Hudson (deceased) estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all mineral resources need safeguarding, and need to be assessed on individual merits.</li> <li>• Safeguarding sites in general industrial areas should not preclude other uses.</li> <li>• Should not preclude use as land fill as part of restoration, but not be preferred option</li> </ul>	<p>Mineral resources do need to be safeguarded to protect them from future sterilisation. Land for waste must be specifically safeguarded to ensure we have enough sites to enable us to manage our waste. Leeds is struggling to fill all its landfill sites and therefore needs to encourage alternative uses.</p>	<p>Further work needed to demonstrate that industrial estates have capacity for waste uses.</p> <p>Provide further land fill data in background evidence report.</p>
094	Mrs Ann Slater		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>• Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites.</li> <li>• Do not support finding alternative uses for quarries as they can be used for non-recyclable waste. Then landscape when full.</li> </ul>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Leeds is having difficulty finding enough waste to fill up land fill sites.</p>	<p>Provide further landfill data in background evidence report.</p>
096	Nicholas Beale	Tarmac Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site specific support, however notes UDP policy for housing allocation may constrain the operation of the main mineral processing site in Cross Green</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Important to protect industrial employment base within Leeds.</p>	<p>Consider re-allocation of UDP housing site for employment purposes through the LDF process.</p>
099	Mr Philip Hutchins	Woodkirk Stone Sales Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports protection of mineral resources</li> <li>• Supports safeguarding existing mineral sites</li> <li>• Alternative uses depends on what type of quarry though. Different uses for different types.</li> </ul>	<p>Supports welcomed.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Review Policy Position Minerals 9 to reflect what might be appropriate for different types of quarry.</p>



