

PDNP post EiP Modifications

Representations on behalf of the Mineral Products Association.

Contact: Mark E North (Director of Planning)

Tel: 07568 427719

Email: [mark.north@mineralproducts.org](mailto:mark.north@mineralproducts.org)

MoD. No. MM137, page 16, Para.11.1

We believe that the text proposed in this modification is unsound as it goes against National Policy in that it still in effect advocates a policy of *managed retreat* for minerals within the National Park. As put forward by the MPA at the examination the Core Strategy predates the NPPF 2012 and would today be found unsound as it goes beyond the requirement of paragraph 116 of the NPPF (2012) explicitly seeking to reduce mineral workings within the national Park. Adjustment to the wording are set out below to remove any reference to reduction of aggregates and other land won mineral.

(New wording in **bold**, deletion of words with ~~strike through~~.)

*The Core Strategy policies MIN1 to MIN4 set out the overall strategic context for minerals development in the National Park. The NPPF (2012) requires that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should, as far as is practical, provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside National Parks. ~~The general direction of Core Strategy policy is to continue to enable the gradual reduction of aggregates and other land won minerals,~~ **When considering mineral development proposals, the Council will take** ~~taking~~ account of the requirements in national policy for ensuring adequate supplies of minerals, and in doing so ~~take~~ ~~taking~~ account of the availability of minerals both inside and outside the National Park. However, the Core Strategy recognises that a different approach will be taken to fluorspar and ~~small-scale building and roofing stone~~, which may be permitted in accordance with Core Strategy policies MIN2 and MIN3.*

We have concerns about the wording of the second part of this paragraph .We consider that the wording is not consistent with the revised wording of policy DMMW1, and is more prescriptive, in that it acts as a catch all for all mineral development, both new and extensions to existing operations, without recognising the potential for such developments to vary in scale and nature as reflected in DMMW1. Suggested rewording is set out below;

(New wording in **bold**, deletion of words with ~~strike through~~.)

*Core Strategy policy MIN1 provides that in order to reflect the approach to major development, new mineral extraction or extensions to existing mineral operations (other than fluorspar proposals and small-scale building and roofing stone) will **be considered against the requirements of Policy DMMW1** ~~not be permitted other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest.~~ Core Strategy policies CC3 and CC4 set out the overall strategic context for waste development. The policies in this Development Management document provide a further level of policy detail for all minerals and waste related developments alongside the Core Strategy policies. Applications that are acceptable in principle with Core Strategy policy will need to be sequentially assessed against these Development Management policies. For practical purposes the Development Management criteria for both minerals and waste management*

*development are brought together in this chapter owing to the close similarity in issues that require consideration.*

ME NORTH

24/01/209