

Our ref: General/40b – Planning Conformity/Final responses/Hull and East Riding

06 June 2008

Alex Codd
Strategic Planning Manager
Planning Policy & Implementation
2nd Floor, Kingston House
Bond Street
Kingston upon Hull
HU1 3ER

Dear Alex

Joint Minerals Development Plan Document – Issues and Options

The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Hull and East Riding Joint Minerals Issues and Options document and to continue its involvement in the development of a coherent spatial planning framework for the region. The comments offered in this letter are intended to be within the spirit of continued and productive joint working.

At this stage, the Assembly's response to the consultation document is a set of officer comments. The aim is to highlight where issues related to general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy might arise. When the DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State a formal Assembly view on its general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy will need to be given.

The following officer comments are made in relation to the current RSS - The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, which was issued by the Secretary of State in May 2008. At this stage in the document's development, the Assembly would like the following comments to be taken into account.

Key Points on the Issues and Options

Overall, we feel that the consultation paper and the options within it provide a comprehensive review of the minerals issues facing the area and how they might be tackled in order to achieve sustainable development. However we do feel that the document needs to further reflect work undertaken to understand the shortfall in Sand and Gravel provision in the region.

The RSS reflects the Government's regional guidelines for the provision of land-won sand and gravel, identifying a total figure of 73 million tonnes (MT) to be

provided between 2001 and 2016. If this figure is extended pro-rata to 2021, the requirement for the period 2006 to 2021 is also 73 MT.

Taking into account identified permitted reserves, the shortfall of sand and gravel during this period is estimated to be 32MT.

The 2004 Annual Report of the Yorkshire and Humber Aggregates Working Party confirms that whilst there are adequate permitted reserves of crushed rock in the region to meet regional guidelines, there is a need for a region-wide study to assess the environmental impacts of additional sand and gravel extraction and the ability of aggregate producing areas to absorb these impacts.

Consequently, the British Geological Society (BGS) were commissioned to complete the first phase of this study. This first phase helped to identify the extent of potential reserves of sand and gravel suitable for use as concrete aggregate reserve, and how these relate to environmental constraints in the region. In doing so, a range of useful planning and GIS datasets were drawn together, and an environmental sensitivity methodology established.

Following on from the BGS study, Land Use Consultants have been commissioned to undertake the second phase of the study. The aim of the second phase is to develop and appraise spatial options for the sub-regional apportionment of action required to meet the shortfall of land-won sand and gravel to 2016, with the view to recommending an option that performs best on sustainability grounds.

The recommended spatial option will be agreed by the RPB in due course, hopefully within 2008. This will then be used to inform a future review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) or its successor, and will need ultimately to be used by Minerals Planning Authorities to inform the identification of sites in Minerals Development Frameworks, and future planning decisions, to make up the estimated 32 MT shortfall of permitted reserves.

I trust that the comments provided here, are helpful to you as you prepare the Preferred Options. Clearly we wish to see the Core Strategy developing in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy and I would be happy to discuss the points we raise here further if it would help this process.

We look forward to working with you further on and to commenting on the Preferred Options document in due course.

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mart - Elliot". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Martin Elliot
Planning Policy Manager