

Aggregates Panel Members:- R N Copping (Chairman), F Clayton (sub), B Engel (sub), G Churchard, R Roberts, R Sanderson, HM Saunders, WA Storey, B York,

Minerals Local Plan Review Outcome of the Second Deposit Draft consultation.

Author:- Julie Reeve (01992 556227), County Development Unit

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise the Panel of the consultation process under taken for the Second Stage Deposit Draft of the Minerals Local Plan review and outline the responses received.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Second Deposit Draft of the Minerals Local Plan Review was placed on deposit for a period of six weeks, from 13 October to 24 November 2003. During this time, 255 forms were received. These responses included 29 new objections to the Second Deposit Draft, 165 objections being maintained and 45 objections being withdrawn with regard to the First Deposit Draft. The remainder of the responses received are considered as invalid objections.
- 2.2 The table attached at appendix A shows all of the new objections that have been made as a result of the Second Deposit Draft consultation. Given the short space of time between the end of the deposit period and this Panel meeting, no recommendations are being made as to the Council's response to these objections at this time.
- 2.3 The table at appendix A has been produced in order for panel members to view the extent of the objections received. It is anticipated that the Council's recommended responses be presented at the next Aggregates Panel meeting. However, there are two matters that are drawn to the Panel's attention at this time for particular consideration.

3. Responses from the Kennedy family

- 3.1 Over 340 response forms , equating to over 1,000 individual comments were received as a result of the public consultation on the First Deposit Draft of the Minerals Local Plan Review. Consultation on the 2nd Deposit Draft has revealed that, due to an administration error, not all of the representations made by the Kennedy family to the 1st Deposit Draft of the Plan were entered onto the database system.

- 3.2 As the Panel did not consider these representations at the First Deposit stage they did not appear in the table of responses initially produced nor were any potential changes included in the Second deposit Draft of the Minerals Local Plan.
- 3.3 All of the responses have now been entered onto the original database. As the Panel has not yet considered these representations, they are now being presented together with the recommended response to them. A schedule of these representations is attached at appendix B.
- 3.4 It is considered that the objections made by the Kennedy family are in no way jeopardised or prejudiced by this. Where suggestions to further change the Plan are accepted by the Panel, these will be incorporated at the pre-inquiry stage of the plan review process in terms of proposed Pre-Inquiry Changes, for consideration by the Inspector. The Pre-Inquiry Changes will also be the subject of further consultation with all interested parties prior to the Inquiry.
- 3.5 A new table of responses to the First Deposit Draft will be produced after the Aggregates Panel showing the full list of representations received and considered. The updated list will then be sent to all the deposit points and the web version updated.
- 3.6 The Second Deposit Draft response table will be placed on public view for a period of twelve weeks before the public inquiry together with the pre-inquiry document. The latter will include any changes arising from their objections that were not included in the Second Deposit Draft and are agreed today by the panel.

4. Response from Arlington

- 4.1 In response to the consultation on the 2nd Deposit Draft Mineral Local Plan Review, Arlington have now indicated that they do not wish Green Belt land at the former British Aerospace site to be identified as a Preferred area. The land is currently identified in the adopted Minerals Local Plan and it has been proposed that it continue to be identified as part of the Review of the Plan. Up to now, Arlington has been supportive of this designation. Arlington now consider that they are unlikely to bring forward proposals for extraction during the period of the Plan (up to 2016) and that they may wish to pursue other options for the land which might be incompatible with the designation as a preferred area.
- 4.2 A meeting with Arlington is scheduled for Friday 12 December 2003 to explore their response further, as some of the response is ambiguous. The Panel will be updated orally on the outcome of this discussion.
- 4.3 Discussions are also proposed with Go East to explore the implications for the Plan process at this stage.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That the Panel acknowledge the contents of this report and the table of representations attached at appendix A.
- 5.2 That the Panel consider the representations made by the Kennedy family and agree the Council's response to them as suggested in Appendix B.
- 5.3 That the Panel note the response from Arlington and that a further report on this matter be considered at the next meeting of the Panel.