

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

**Responses to the representations made to the Second Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan Review.**

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

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To inform the panel of the representations made to the Second Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan and to seek support for the officer recommendations in response to those representations.

**2. Background**

- 2.1 The County Council received over 400 forms concerning the Second Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan Review, following the formal deposit period from 13 October 2003 to 24 November 2003. These responses included 22 new objections to the Second Deposit Draft, 248 objections to the Plan being maintained and 46 objections (to the First Deposit Draft) being withdrawn. The remainder of the responses (88) received are considered as invalid objections.
- 2.3 The table attached at Appendix A shows a summary of all the valid objections that have been made as a result of the Second Deposit Draft consultation, together with the officers' recommended response. The full responses from the consultees are also available, for any interested person to inspect. The table is arranged in Plan order so that all comments about each part of the Plan can be viewed together.
- 2.4 Planning Policy Guidance Note 12 – Development Plans, states that at second deposit stage, objections can only be made regarding the changes that have been made (e.g.) as a result of a previous objection. The County Council can not accept representations that should have been made at the first deposit stage.
- 2.5 A number of objections have been received that will not be considered by the County Council because they are unduly made. The table attached at Appendix B lists the unduly made objections and the reason why they will not be considered by the Panel.
- 2.6 In Appendix B, the first block of objections (1-13) are unduly made because they do not relate to changes that have been made to the Plan and the objectors did not make representation at the First Deposit stage.

- 2.7 The remaining objections are unduly made because they are repeating the original objection made to the Plan. The original objections made by these representatives are being maintained and so there is no need to repeat the objection.
- 2.8 An update on the status of the Arlington objection will be given orally at the meeting.

### **3. The Next Stage of The Plan Review**

- 3.1 The Inspector will automatically consider objections that are being maintained by objectors from the First Deposit Draft and any unresolved from the Second Deposit Draft at the Inquiry stage. The Inspector will also consider all objections that have not formally been withdrawn. This means that the number of objections moving forward to the Inquiry stage will be higher than that stated above.
- 3.2 In order to accommodate further changes that have been made to the Plan following Second Deposit, a Pre-Inquiry changes schedule will be produced as the next stage of the review process, based on the Panel's agreed responses to the objections.
- 3.3 These Pre-Inquiry changes will not, however, be considered as part of the statutory plan preparation process. These changes will therefore require a formal modifications procedure following the inquiry to incorporate them into the Plan if they are supported by the Inspector.
- 3.4 The County Council will produce one set of the proposed changes together with the reasons for them. This document will then be advertised in the same way as the deposit plans and representations invited. Any objections received as a result of the Pre-Inquiry document will be pursued at the Inquiry.

### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1 To note the comments made in response to the Second deposit Draft of the Minerals Local Plan and to agree the officers' recommended response.