Matter 11 Hearing Statement – Land and Mineral Management

In general we will rely upon statements already made but in answer to the Inspector's specific questions, we propose to explain the answers in red inserted below.

Safeguarding

5. What is the justification for including general minimum buffer widths around low and high output aggregate quarries? Is this in line with the PPG? It is important to ensure that the means of safeguarding is adequate otherwise safeguarding will not be effective. Therefore not only should the mineral resource be safeguarded but a buffer zone should be applied around the resource.

6. Would a suitable alternative be a buffer beyond the MSA resource? See above.

7. If so, what should this buffer be (if any) for each resource and how does it take account of the risks of sterilisation of part of the resource, bearing in mind that buffers are likely to vary

between minerals and the likely method of extraction? It is important not to confuse buffer zones required around a quarry, where the minimum necessary buffer can be precisely determined by environmental impact assessment, and buffer zones shown in a policy document around a resource area to protect the resource from sterilisation, which must err on the generous side to maintain effectiveness of the safeguarding policy until the resource comes forward for development when environmental impact assessment will be able to precisely identify the extent of the buffer zone.

8. Should the MSAs plus a buffer constitute the extent of the Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) or should the MSAs and MCAs coincide? The use of two definitions are confusing. They should be combined as MSAs.

12. Are there any planned minerals facilities within the County that have not been safeguarded?

See plan with email (5th June) to Guy Robinson attached.

Dear Guy

Peter Barkwill has asked me to provide you with a revised proposed Safeguarding Area for Moons Hill Quarry Complex. I attach your plan on which I have roughly drawn a revised line and coloured in blue the area which we believe should be safeguarded but it needs a little explanation.

In the west the safeguarding area is slightly extended to prevent sterilisation of material immediately to the west of the quarry and between the quarry and Knapps Farm.

To the north we see no reason why Stoke St Michael should be within the Safeguarding Area. Development in the village is unlikely to prejudice future quarry plans and this area need not be safeguarded.

The land to the south of the Old Frome Road near Long Cross Farm need not be safeguarded as the South Tip will form a strong barrier between the road and any quarrying activity.

To the east of Walltyning Plantation and south of Tadhill, outside the current Safeguarding Area is a site for which planning permission was sought in the late 1980s by RMC. They had drilled this land and proven 16 million tonnes of andesite. However, planning permission was refused and RMC walked away from the prospect and the land was purchased by Wainwrights. This is a potential future site for andesite extraction which should be safeguarded from sterilisation. I do not have any detail of the application, although I am sure information must be kept in the Council offices, but I have marked the approximate area on the plan.

I attach a copy of the geological resource map which shows that the andesite extends eastwards in a substantial resource block from Walltyning Plantation. We suggest that all the land between the two Safeguarding blocks, which will comprise either andesite or tuffs and encompasses the old application site, should also be protected.

I hope this makes sense but, if not, do let me know.

With kind regards

Yours etc

John



