

Matters, Issues & Questions:

Matter 1: Minerals – Minerals Allocations in General

Question 4 - 13

Minerals allocations in general

4. Besides the SA and *Notes from Site Panel Assessment Sessions*, October 2016, are there any other overall assessments in the evidence base relating to each of the individual sites put forward?

The *Introduction to sites and areas assessment (October 2016) (SD14)* is an overview of the site assessment process and background papers and includes reference to:

- Initial screening of submitted sites and areas, October 2016 (SD16)
- Identification of areas of search for concreting sand & gravel, October 2016 (SD19)
- Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites and Areas of Search, November 2016 (CD18)
- Discounted Sites Summary Document, October 2016 (SD18)
- Interpretation of Level 1 SFRA sequential test findings, October 2016 (SD23)
- Impact of Site Submissions on Agricultural Land, October 2016 (SD20)
- Traffic Assessment of sites, October 2015 (SD21)
- Traffic Assessment of site appendices, October 2015 (SD22)

In addition there is the *Audit Trail of sites from Issues and Options to Publication (SD13)*.

5. In general how have mineral sites been assessed for allocation in the MWJP? In a few paragraphs please provide a brief overview including the methodology, how constraints and opportunities have been considered, and how allocations have been chosen over omission sites. References (with page and paragraph numbers) may be given to relevant evidence.

Identification and consideration of constraints have been built into the steps of assessment of sites set out in *Site Identification and Assessment Methodology and Scope (SD15)* and used within the sustainability appraisal of sites (*Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 1 (CD27)* and *Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 2 (CD28)*). The same constraint information has informed the identification of key sensitivities and development requirements for individual sites, and areas of search, proposed for allocation as set out in *Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites and Areas of Search, November 2016 (CD18)* and the identification of key sensitivities for individual sites that ultimately have been discounted (omitted) as set out in *Discounted Sites Summary Document, October 2016 (SD18)*. The overall process has also been

informed by the consultation responses received at the various stages of consultation; e.g. Historic England's MJP33 (Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham, page 24, CD18) response (*Summary of responses for Issues and Options IPC06* p.294) led initially to the identification of an excluded area at *Preferred Options* (PPC02 p.25), then comments (*Summary of responses to preferred options consultation PPC16*, p.72) led to on-site discussions in early 2016 prior to *Publication* of a reduced area (CD18 p.27), and further comments (*Publication draft responses* (CD37, p.24).

Where possible and appropriate opportunities for enhancement as part of the development requirements have been identified, for example: reconnecting the Thornborough Henges to their landscape setting as part of restoration, as illustrated by the last bullet point regarding site MJP06 (Langwith Hall Farm, east of Well, page 16, CD18) and habitat creation as part of a restoration scheme, as illustrated by the last bullet point regarding site MJP55 (Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks page 77, CD18) Other opportunities have also been flagged, such as the control of invasive species at sites such as MJP33 (Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham, page 24, CD18) .

The reasons for allocation of a site or discounting of a site are set out in respect of each site within *Publication Draft Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites CD18* and *Discounted sites summary document SD18* respectively. For each site the contribution to Policy requirements has been considered including, where appropriate:

- geographical location, such as in respect of the north-south distribution of sand and gravel, e.g. MJP06 (Langwith Hall Farm, east of Well, page 16, CD18) would supply the southwards distribution area (CD18 p. 17), whilst MJP21 (Land at Killerby, page 32, CD18) would supply the northwards area (CD18 p. 34),
- scale in terms of the estimated reserve and output, e.g. the estimated reserve of MJP33 (Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham, page 24, CD18) is 3,500,000 (tonnes) whereas the estimated reserve for MJP39 (Quarry House, West Tanfield, page 32 SD18) was 300,000 (tonnes)
- mineral to be supplied, e.g. Magnesian limestone, building stone

All set in the context of the potential impacts of the development, including matters such as site access, leading to a conclusion as to whether other sites were, or were not, more appropriate to help meet requirements. In a few cases the balance of judgement on the justification for allocation altered between *Preferred Options* and *Publication* (e.g. MJP12 Whitewall Quarry, near Norton) and the different conclusions are set out in the respective entries (PPC02 p.103 and SD18 p.56).

6. Are the reasons for selecting allocated minerals sites/preferred areas/areas of search over reasonable alternatives made clear in the SA? Have all reasonable alternatives been assessed and are reasons for rejection set out?

The process for identifying and appraising potential minerals sites is summarised in section 2.3 of *SA Report (CD23)* with further detail provided within the *Site*

Identification and Assessment Methodology Document (SD15). The process required the identification and initial screening of potentially suitable sites and areas (*SD16*), the consideration of key constraints before applying the SA Framework for the sites, and the review of sites at panel meetings.

It should be noted that while the policy assessment considered policy alternative options as alternatives, sites were generated from a 'call for sites' (rather than the Plan identifying sites from the 'top down'). Alternatives were taken to be the full list of submitted sites, only some of which were taken forward on the basis of their overall sustainability and contribution to the Plan, while some proposed sites were also withdrawn from the selection process by submitters as opposed to being discounted by Authorities.

The outcome of the appraisal of mineral sites against SA Framework is summarised in the SA Report with full detail provided in *Appendix 3 Parts 1 and 2 (CD27 and CD28)*. Appendix 3 (parts 1 and 2) (CD27 and CD28) include the SA scores for each site, as well as the key issues and mitigation. The reasons for acceptance or rejection are summarised in the *Discounted Site Summary Document (SD18)* and the *audit trail of progression of sites from Issues and Options Stage to Publication documents (SD13)*.

7. Should the policies state in which area (district/borough/national park/city) the allocation/preferred area/area of search is located to provide clarity and to facilitate its location within Appendix 1?

Yes. The area in which each allocation/preferred area/area of search is located can be added to the policies to assist understanding. Relevant modifications will be included in the 'Main Modifications' document to reflect this.

8. Are all allocations shown on the Policies Map, and to be effective should the Policies Map be referred to in the various policies that allocate minerals sites/areas?

All allocations are located on the *Policies Map (CD22 and CD23)*. On the interactive version (CD22), allocation references are revealed by clicking on the site, but references to individual sites are currently not on the paper version of the *Policies Map (CD23)*, but will be added. The boundaries of MJP11 (Gebdykes Quarry near Masham, page 28, CD18) for CD22 and CD23 need to be updated to reflect areas as shown on CD18 which would be done at Main Modifications as would the boundary changes to MJP17 (land to the south of Catterick, page 36, CD18) and MJP21 (land at Killerby, page 32, CD18)..

The Policies Map will be referred to in the various policies that allocate minerals sites/areas which will be included in Main Modifications.

9. Where it has been agreed by the Authorities to amend the boundaries of minerals allocations (such as MJP17 and MJP21) are the new boundaries shown in Appendix 1?

The boundaries shown in *Appendix 1 – Allocated Sites and Areas of Search (CD18)* as submitted were produced at *Publication*. Boundary changes to MJP17 (Land to south of Catterick, page 36, CD18) and MJP21 (land at Killerby, page 32, CD18), referred to PC104 and PC102 of the *Addendum of Proposed Changes to the Publication draft (CD08)*, July 2017 will be amended within *Appendix 1 Allocated Sites (CD18)* at Main Modifications.

10. How does the evidence demonstrate that the allocations in each of Policies M07 (Concreting sand and gravel), M08 (Building sand), M09 (Crushed Rock), M13 (Clay) and M15 (Building Stone) are appropriate to meet identified requirements?

Submitters of sites were asked to provide information on the type of mineral proposed for extraction; the tonnage anticipated and whether it was based on detailed geological information including borehole surveys already undertaken or a desk-based assessment.

Sites were also compared with BGS data regarding whether that location was indicated as having a resource and whether it was likely to be viable, such as MJP06 (Langwith Hall Farm, east of Well, page 16, CD18) and MJP21 (Land at Killerby, page 32, CD18) for concreting sand and gravel sites relative to Policy M07 (*Meeting concreting sand and gravel requirements*); such as MJP30 (West Heslerton Quarry, page 62, CD18) and MJP54 (Mill Balk Quarry, Great Heck, page 98, CD18) for Policy M08 (*Meeting building sand requirements*); MJP08 (Settrington Quarry, page 58, CD18) and MJP10 (Potgate Quarry, North Stainley, page 44, CD18) for Policy M09 (*Meeting crushed rock requirements*); MJP45 (Land to north of Hemingbrough, page 73, CD18) and MJP55 (Land adjacent to former Escrick brickworks, page 77, CD18) for Policy M13 (*Continuity of supply of clay*).

Evidence from existing quarries in an area was also used derived from aerial photos, maps, adjacent previous applications and site visits as part of the site assessment process and examples are:

- MJP22 (Hensall Quarry, page 92, CD18) was next to the existing Hensall quarry (Policy M07) (LPA/58);
- the face of the west side of MJP44 (Land between Plasmor Block making plan, Great Heck and Pollington Airfield, page 95, CD18) was visible from the adjacent Heck Works (Policy M08) (LPA/59);
- MJP10 (Potgate Quarry, North Stainley, page 44, CD18) was next to the existing Potgate Quarry (LPA/60), as was MJP11 (Gebdykes Quarry, page 28, CD18) next to Gebdykes (Policy M09) (LPA/61);
- MJP45 (Land North of Hemingbrough, page 73, CD18) was next to the active Hemingbrough Quarry (LPA/62) & MJP55 next to the former clay workings that supplied the Escrick Brickworks (now demolished) (LPA/63);
- Brows Quarry MJP63 (page 65, CD18) overlaps a former pre-planning permission era quarry (Policy M15) (LPA/64);

Other factors taken into consideration included matters such as size of the reserve, annual output, anticipated commencement and period of time for operation and landowner support (relevant to deliverability—hence the exclusion of MJP35 (Ruddings Farm, Walshford, page 25, SD18) where it became evident due to lack of responses to enquiries after a couple of years that the site was no longer being promoted).

11. In general how does the Plan seek to ensure that any significant constraints/adverse impacts of development of these allocations are overcome/mitigated to an acceptable level?

As referred to in the response to Q.5 above, consideration of constraints has been built into the steps of assessment of sites set out in *Site Identification and Assessment Methodology and Scope* (SD15), notably via Step 2 and Appendix 4. Constraints were also examined within the sustainability appraisal of sites (*Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 1* (CD27) and *Sustainability appraisal report – Appendix 3 part 2* (CD28)). *Publication Draft Plan Appendix 1: Allocated Sites and Areas of Search* (CD18) identifies key sensitivities and development requirements for each allocation derived from the site assessments and consultation process for individual sites. Paragraph 1.9 (page 4) of CD18 explains that the sensitivities and development principles should not be regarded as an exhaustive list, and that proposals need to take account of matters relevant at the time of the application (such as policy changes, designation changes, pre-application advice). It is therefore not considered that any of the specific allocations are likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated. Furthermore, it is not considered that any of the specific allocations are likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated.

12. Are any of the specific allocations likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated? In such cases how have the benefits of allocation been demonstrated to outweigh the detriment?

It is not considered that any of the specific allocations are likely to result in significant adverse impacts that could not be sufficiently mitigated, because the key sensitivities and development requirements for each allocation have been identified and it is not considered that these raise any circumstances that would not be possible to address within the planning application proposals for a site, including through application of the development management policies in the Plan.

13. Do any of the regulatory bodies have outstanding concerns about any of the allocations? If so, what are these concerns and how have they been addressed?

No. None of the regulatory bodies have outstanding concerns as previous concerns have been addressed. For instance, Natural England confirmed on 9

May 2017 (LPA/12 that revisions to text in respect of the key sensitivities of MJP14 (Ripon Quarry, North Stainley, page 40, CD18), development requirements, assessment and HRA addressed earlier concerns. The relevant text is: F48 and F49 in the *Schedule of Further Proposed Changes to the Publication Draft, November 2017 (SD01)* and *Sustainability Appraisal of Schedule of Further Proposed Changes to Publication Draft, November 2017 (SD02)* and P48 and P49, plus Table B2 in *Addendum to Habitats Regulation Assessment, November 2017 (SD03)*. PC100 of the *Addendum of Proposed Changes, July 2017 (CD08)* addressed the Environment Agency's MJP33 (Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham, page 24, CD18) comment at *Publication*. Historic England has no allocation related concerns following the *Addendum of Proposed Changes, July 2017 (CD08)*. Highways England, the Health & Safety Executive, the Highway Authority and Environmental Health Officers in the Plan area have no outstanding concerns.

Prepared by;

**North Yorkshire County Council
City of York Council
North York Moors National Park Authority**

Appendix

Matters, Issues & Questions:

Matter 1: Minerals – Minerals Allocations in General

Question 4 - 13

Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
Q7	56	M07	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Killerby (MJP21), in Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts</u></p> <p>In Part 1) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Home Farm, Kirkby Fleetham (MJP33), in Hambleton District</u> <u>Land South of Catterick (MJP17), in Hambleton and Richmondshire Districts</u></p> <p>In Part 2) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Langwith Hall Farm (MJP06), in Hambleton District</u> <u>Land at Pennycroft and Thorneyfields, Ripon (MJP14), in Harrogate Borough</u> <u>A Preferred Area on Land at Oaklands (MJP07), in Hambleton District</u></p>
Q7	59	M08	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p><u>Land at Hensall Quarry (MJP22), in Selby District</u> <u>Land at West Heslerton Quarry (MJP30), in Ryedale</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><u>District</u> <u>Land adjacent to Plasmor blockworks, Great Heck (MJP44), in Selby District</u> <u>Land at Mill Balk Quarry, Great Heck (MJP54), in Selby District</u></p>
Q7	60	M09	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Jackdaw Crag South, Stutton (MJP23), in Selby District</u> <u>Land at Barnsdale Bar Quarry (MJP28), in Selby District</u> <u>Land at Went Edge Quarry, Kirk Smeaton (MJP29), in Selby District</u></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land at Gebdykes Quarry (MJP11), in Hambleton District and Harrogate Borough</u> <u>Land at Potgate Quarry (MJP10), in Harrogate Borough</u></p> <p>In Maintenance of supply ... allocated sites at:</p> <p><u>Land at Settrington Quarry (MJP08) (Jurassic Limestone), in Ryedale District</u> <u>Land at Darrington Quarry (MJP24) (retention of processing plant site and haul road), in Selby District</u></p>
Q7	69-70	M13	<p>Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site:</p> <p>In Part 1) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land to north of Hemingbrough clay pit (MJP45), in Selby District</u></p> <p>In Part 1) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>A Preferred Area on land adjacent to former Escrick Brickworks (MJP55), in Selby District</u></p> <p>In Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Land north of Duttons Farm, Upper Poppleton (MJP52), in the City of York</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
Q7	72-73	M15	Insert relevant District/Borough/National Park/City to site: In Part 4) of the Policy: Land at Brows Quarry (MJP63), in Ryedale District.
Q8	-	Policies Map	Revise MJP11, MJP17 and MJP21 site boundaries on the interactive map
Q8	-	Policies Map	Revise MJP11, MJP17 and MJP21 site boundaries on paper version of the following maps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aerodrome Safeguarding - Policy No. = D10 • Agricultural Land Classification - Policy No. = D12 • Coal Mining Development Referral Area - Policy No. = D13 • Water Environment including Flood Risk - Policy No. = D09 • PEDL licences - Policy No.s M16, M17 & M18 • Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP FIVE • Environmental and Historic Designations - MAP SIX • Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps - MAP 5 • Minerals Resource Safeguarding Maps - MAP 6
Q8	56	M07	Revise 1 st sentence of the Policy: Requirements for concreting sand and gravel will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites and areas identified in the Joint Plan <u>and shown on the Policies Map</u> for working.
Q8	59	M08	Revise 1 st sentence of the Policy: Requirements for building sand will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites allocated in the Joint Plan <u>and shown on the Policies Map</u> for working.
Q8	60	M09	Revise 1 st sentence of the Policy: Requirements for Magnesian Limestone over the Plan period will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites allocated in the Joint Plan <u>and shown on the Policies Map</u> for working.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
Q8	69-70	M13	<p>Revise Part 1) i) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Allocation as shown on the Policies Map</u> required in order to meet requirements during ...</p> <p>Revise Part 1) ii) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Allocation as shown on the Policies Map</u> potentially required to contribute to maintaining longer term ...</p> <p>Revise Part 2) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Maintaining the supply of clay is also supported through identifying an allocated site as shown on the Policies Map</u> for engineering ...</p>
Q8	73	M15	<p>Revise Part 4) of the Policy:</p> <p><u>Additional reserves to help to maintain the supply of building stone are also provided through a site allocation as shown on the Policies Map</u> for: ...</p>
Q9	35	Appendix 1	Revise site boundary of MJP21
Q9	39	Appendix 1	Revise site boundary of MJP17