

**Bridgend County Borough Council  
Bridgend Local Development Plan Examination**

**Schedule of Matters Arising Changes (MAC) with amended Inspector Comments (IC) in green**

**Session 10 – Minerals**

MAC Reference	Location in LDP	Details of Change	Reason for Change
<p><b>MAC 10.1 (Action Point 10.1)</b></p>	<p><b>Policy ENV12</b></p>	<p><b>Amend Policy ENV12 to read:</b></p> <p>Coal extraction operations <u>within 500 metres of a settlement boundary</u> will be considered unacceptable in principle <u>unless they are deemed as exceptions as outlined in paragraph 49 of Minerals Technical Advice Note (TAN) 2: Coal.</u> <del>where they-:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>1) Are within 500 metres of a settlement boundary (unless they are deemed exceptions by the council as they constitute acceptable land reclamation works or prior development operations to facilitate development;</del></li> <li><del>2) Affect any Natura 200 Network site (including SACs); or</del></li> <li><del>3) Affect any SSSI</del></li> </ul> <p>In all of the remaining areas of the safeguarded coal resource shown on the Proposals Map, <u>where exceptional circumstances are not present in the context of the above, unaffected by 1) to 3)</u> proposals will need to satisfy the <del>following criteria</del> <u>mineral development criteria as outlined in Policy ENV11.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i) There would be no demonstrable harm to amenity or the environment;</del></li> <li><del>ii) There are clear community benefits; and</del></li> <li><del>iii) It would be in the public interest for development to proceed</del></li> </ul>	<p>To provide further clarity to the Plan in terms of how the Council will have regard to coal extraction operations in the context of Technical Advice Note (TAN) 2: Coal.</p>
		<p><b>IC1</b> - The reinstatement of the 500m buffer zone is supported. <b>IC2</b> - Why does the second paragraph apply only in the <u>safeguarded</u> coal resource area and not elsewhere such as in the tertiary resource area where the Coal Authority evidence suggests there is still some potential for coal extraction proposals to come forward?</p>	

		<p><b>IC3</b> - What is “where exceptional circumstances are not present in the context of the above” this intended to mean? The MTAN para 49 exceptions only apply within 500m of settlements and are not relevant to proposals elsewhere. I suggest that this text is deleted. Indeed the text could be replaced by ‘Elsewhere proposals for coal extraction will need to satisfy the mineral development criteria of Policy ENV11’ [but also see comment IC4 below]</p> <p><b>IC4</b> - Why has BCBC not retained the reference to weighing the residual harm of coal operations with any community benefits as suggested in Action Point 10.1(c)?</p>	
<b>MAC 10.2 (Action Point 10.2)</b>	<b>Para 4.3.1</b>	<p><b>Amend paragraph 4.3.1 to read:</b></p> <p>At present (2011), the total aggregate reserves figure is approximately <del>40</del>107 years, although an increase in sales of high purity limestone for no-aggregate use, such as sinter flux in the steel making industry (Port Talbot steelworks) would reduce this. This figure is sufficient to satisfy the region’s requirements in accordance with the Regional Technical Statement (see Background Paper: Minerals) <u>and where there are identified shortfalls in reserves in neighbouring authorities</u> <del>As there is a slight shortfall of reserves in the Vale of Glamorgan, to meet their minimum 10-year landbank throughout their plan period, the any</del> ‘excess’ of reserves in Bridgend <u>could be utilised to address such a</u> <del>are relied upon by the Vale of Glamorgan to meet this</del> shortfall. This collaborative working between authorities is promoted by the Regional Technical Statement (RTS) and acknowledges the fact that minerals can only be worked where they occur. Hence, administrative boundaries should not be seen as a barrier to the objective of providing a sustainable supply of resources close to markets.</p>	To provide further clarity to the Plan with regards aggregate reserves and collaborative working between authorities.
		<p><b>IC5</b> - What is the evidence to support this new <u>aggregate reserves</u> figure of <b>107</b> years? Paragraph 4.3.1 of the submitted LDP states the figure as only <b>40</b> years (although this figure remains disputed by representors who consider the figure to be lower because of constraints on the extraction of available reserves). ). By contrast the Council’s rebuttal statement referred to a landbank of ‘at least <b>25</b> years’. In Document SD08 the Council described the aggregate <u>and</u> non-aggregate reserve as approximately <b>87</b> years and suggested that there is approximately 43 years of reserves for aggregate and non-aggregate use [which I take to mean <b>43</b> years for each material on a</p>	

		50:50 split although it was also suggested that the split may be 60% non aggregates to 40% aggregates]. How has a 43 year <u>aggregate</u> reserve since expanded to 107 years? Should this sentence be replaced by: 'In 2011, the aggregate reserve figure was estimated at about 40 years after allowing for the likely sales of high purity limestone for non-aggregate use, such as sinter flux in the steel making industry (Port Talbot steelworks). An increase in demand for the latter material could reduce the available aggregate reserve. This figure etc ...'	
--	--	---	--

MAC Reference	Location in LDP	Details of Change	Reason for Change
MAC10.3 (Action Point 10.3)	Proposals Map	Please refer to Appendix A attached.	For consistency and clarity.
		IC6 - Appendix A is plan showing revised boundary definition for the quarry at South Cornelly.	
MAC10.4 (Action Point 10.4)	Proposals Map	Please refer to Appendix B attached.	For consistency and clarity.
		IC7 - Appendix B shows Proposals Map revision to confirm that REG4 site at Stormy Down is covered by a minerals protection zone.	
MAC10.5 (Action Point 10.5)	Para 5.1.17	<p><b>Amend paragraph 5.1.17 to read:</b></p> <p>However, the site also lies within a Mineral Protection Zone defined to protect high quality limestone and as such planning consents which have been granted have been temporary in nature albeit relatively long-term, with end dates of 2035, well beyond the LDP period of 2021. Any related activity to that which is existing will continue to be temporary, <a href="#">having regard to the extent of the available landbank at that time and when the limestone resource is likely to be required</a>, in order not to sterilise potential future mineral extraction.</p>	To provide further clarity to the Plan in terms of how the Council will have regard to the limestone reserves at Stormy Down Airfield when considering future planning applications on the site.

<b>MAC10.6 (Action Point 10.6)</b>	<b>Policy ENV11</b>	<b>Amend Policy ENV11 to read:</b>  1) Measures <del>can</del> <u>will</u> be taken to reduce, and where possible avoid, damage or disturbance to the environment to acceptable levels with specific reference to:  a) Pollution or disturbance to ground or surface water supply or drainage; b) The impact on the landscape of the area; c) The effect on nature conservation and wildlife interests of the site and adjoining land; d) The effect on agricultural interests particularly on high quality agricultural land; e) The effect on sites of archaeological importance; f) The impact on the stability of adjoining land; and g) The potential for mine gas emissions.  2) Measures <del>can</del> <u>will</u> be taken to reduce damage or disturbance to neighbouring land uses to acceptable levels including:	For consistency and clarity.
		<b>IC8 - Agreed</b>	
<b>MAC10.7 (Action Point 10.7)</b>	<b>Para 4.3.9</b>	<b>Amend Paragraph 4.3.9 to read:</b>  This policy seeks to list all of the environmental factors against which applications for mineral development, including coal, are assessed. Policy ENV11 will be used to assess proposals for new development, extensions, and mineral review applications. Given the variety and diverse nature of such applications, however, other factors such as <del>planning gain</del> <u>the need for planning agreements/obligations in accordance with Policy SP14</u> may also need to be considered for major development.	For consistency and clarity.
		<b>IC9 - Agreed</b>	
<b>MAC10.8 (Action Point 10.8)</b>	<b>Policy ENV13(4)</b>	<b>Amend Policy ENV13(4) to read:</b>  <del>Addresses</del> <u>Assesses</u> the need for formal environmental assessment for any identified stabilisation works.	For consistency and clarity.
		<b>IC10 - Agreed</b>	
<b>MAC10.9 (Action Point 10.9)</b>	<b>Policy ENV16</b>	<b>Amend Policy ENV16 to read:</b>  Proposals for the treatment, processing and distribution of commercial and industrial waste such as:	

		<p>i) Materials Recycling Facilities (MRF);  ii) Mechanical Biological Treatment facilities (MBT); <del>or</del>  iii) In-vessel/anaerobic digestion composting facilities; or  iv) <a href="#">Facilities for the recycling of construction and demolition waste.</a></p>	
		<b>IC11 - Agreed</b>	
<b>MAC10.10 (Action Point 10.10)</b>	<b>Para 4.5.10</b>	<p><b>Amend Paragraph 4.5.10 to read:</b></p> <p>Commercial and industrial waste comprises approximately 60% of the total waste generated in any given area. Such waste takes a number of different forms such as business food waste, green horticultural waste, plastics, wood, glass, paper, metal <a href="#">and construction and demolition waste such as soil, bricks, concrete and stone etc.</a></p>	
		<b>IC12 - Agreed</b>	