

[REDACTED]

From: David and Bobbie Prime [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 January 2018 17:21
To: Planning Policy
Subject: response to the mineral consultation document
Attachments: mineral consultation document.docx

Attached are my responses to the mineral consultation document.

Roberta Prime

[REDACTED]

Q1: Do you think any further information should be included in the overview of the area?

More reference is needed to areas already threatened by flooding, the danger of which may be exacerbated by minerals extraction.

More consideration should be made to the need to conserve agricultural land and not allow it to be destroyed by mineral extraction. Our excessive dependency on imported food and the massive destruction of agricultural land which has taken place in recent years will leave our country in a very vulnerable situation in the future.

You should most certainly hold very firmly to your avowed intentions to “uphold strong environmental principles and enhance the environment” and avoid “unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health.”

Massive industrial-scale extraction in environmentally sensitive areas such as that which was proposed at Shelford would be totally unacceptable in the light of your own statements.

Q2: Do you agree with the draft vision? Are there other things we should include?

Throughout the report there are only brief passing references to recycling and development of alternatives to extraction of minerals which I think shows a sad *lack of vision*. Your state that there is a lack of reliable data concerning recycling within the county. Should that not be an area for your department to investigate more thoroughly and promote ?

A much stronger will and initiative to a commitment to developing alternatives to sand and gravel extraction needs to be demonstrated. The web is full of documents from other areas and countries which show a much greater commitment to reducing the reliance on extracted materials. We HAVE to take all steps NOW to conserve our planet before it is too late.

Q3: Are the strategic issues appropriate? Are there others we should consider?

The strategic issues are appropriate as long as they are strictly adhered to.

Q4: Do you think the average 10 year sales figure the most suitable methodology for forecasting future aggregate demand in Nottinghamshire. If not please identify any alternatives you feel are realistic and deliverable and the evidence to support this approach.

In theory it seems sensible, but it allows no room for considering the impact from potential for using more recycled products in the future. Any forecasts of the volume of minerals required are based on the present heavy reliance on extracted aggregates, whereas with more vigorous development of recycling, those needs would diminish.

Q5: Do you think the same methodology (most recent average 10 years sales) should be used for each aggregate or is there merit in using different methodologies for different aggregates?

Q6: Do you think extensions to existing permitted quarries should be prioritised over new greenfield quarries?

In theory, yes, If they are still viable and will cause minimum negative impacts on nearby communities. Why destroy more countryside unnecessarily? The term “greenfield sites” seems a sadly ironic misnomer.

Q7: Should different approaches (new sites/extensions to existing permitted quarries) be adopted for individual mineral types?

Every decision must take into account the potential long term impact on the environment and existing communities.

Q8: How important is it to maintain a geographical spread of sand and gravel quarries across the County (i.e. Idle Valley, near Newark and near Nottingham) to minimise the distance minerals are transported to markets?

There is a contradiction here in that you state that minerals extracted in the county are transported to Rotherham and Doncaster which can hardly minimise the transportation distances.

Q9: Would it be more appropriate to prioritise specific areas above others?

Those areas which will have the least negative impacts on communities and the environment.

Q10: Is it economical to transport mineral by river barge and if so should proposed quarries with the potential for moving sand and gravel by river barge be prioritised over other proposals?

50 years ago, the River Trent was a busy highway with barges transporting goods and causing no negative impacts on communities or the environment. Sadly, over the years, this has dwindled to nothing. Any means of transport which reduces the number of heavy vehicles on the roads is an environmental priority ,even if it is more costly, and should be thoroughly investigated. However, developers, who want to maximise their profits, are likely to find arguments to evade this, even if at the outset they seem to support it!

Q11: Are you aware of any other issues relating to Sherwood Sandstone provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Q12: Is there evidence to suggest that additional crushed rock reserves are required to meet demand n Nottinghamshire over the Plan period? If so please provide this evidence.

Q13: Are you aware of any other issues relating to crushed rock provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

You state that alternative aggregates provide for 29% of consumption and the new minerals plan should anticipate an expansion of their use.

Q14: Are you aware of any issues relating to alternative aggregates that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

As already stated elsewhere, a much greater emphasis and commitment should be demonstrated.

Q15: Should the Plan identify a specific replacement quarry (remote extension/ new site) to Dorket Head clay pit or should a criteria based policy be developed to ensure that an adequate supply of clay can be maintained over the Plan period?

Q16: Is a criteria based policy the most suitable approach to cover the potential for new brick works and associated clay pits?

Q17: Should the plan seek to identify specific site allocations for Gypsum provision or should a criteria based policy be developed to ensure an adequate supply of Gypsum can be maintained over the Plan period?

Q18: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of Gypsum that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan review?

Q19: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of silica sand that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan review?

Q20: Are you aware of any issues regarding the provision of industrial dolomite that should be considered as part of the Minerals Local Plan Review?

Q21: Is there evidence to suggest that additional building stone reserves are required to meet demand in Nottinghamshire over the Plan period? If so please provide this evidence

Q22: Are you aware of any other issues relating to building stone provision that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Q23: Are you aware of any issues relating to coal extraction that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Fossil fuels should be a thing of the past and we should put all our energies into sustainable and renewable sources of energy.

Q24: Are you aware of any issues relating to hydrocarbon extraction that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Hydrocarbon extraction of existing mine gas would be acceptable as it would have a positive environmental impact and involve no further land destruction, but shale gas and coal bed extraction would both have destructive impacts.

Q25: Do you agree with the proposed development management policy areas? Are there any others that should be covered?

Q26: Are you aware of any issues relating to minerals safeguarding that should be considered through the Minerals Local Plan review?

Roberta Prime

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]