

## Issue 11: Addressing minerals and waste requirements alongside environmental considerations

**Strategic Objective 11: Ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local needs whilst taking account of impacts on environments and local communities.**

id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	51 Do you have any views on factors that may impact on the supply and demand for mineral resources in Rutland that should be taken into account as part of preparing the Local Plan?
4224	The British Horse Society (Wendy Bannerman, Access Field Officer West and East Midlands) [1145]		Where mineral extraction sites are identified, PRoW and the informal off-road network should be considered and protected through all phases of the extraction and processing.
4085	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		For the reasons set out in response to Q51, we should only be safeguarding minerals in Rutland sufficient for our own use, except where there is clear established evidence shown to be a valuable asset for which there is a regional or national shortfall. If mineral 'Safeguarding Areas' are defined they should only cover the extent of the mineral deposits themselves and not include any built-up area. It is inconceivable that there should not be proper policies relating to buffer zones around the extraction of minerals and yet that seems to be the current position. Greetham Quarry extension comes within 40 metres of housing. Best practice suggests that 500 metres is a more appropriate figure. We suspect the problem with this comes back to the size of Rutland, where despite a relatively small population the size of the county mitigates against having proper buffer zones. This alone should justify imposing a more robust approach with clear limitations of scale and proper safeguarding measures.
4083	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		Whilst accepting that we have to protect valuable minerals and quarrying assets and need wherever possible to identify and maintain land banks, we like other parishes are concerned that the small county of Rutland is being expected to provide resources beyond the local and the sub-regional requirements.

3976	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		<p>We are concerned that the small county of Rutland is being expected to provide mineral resources beyond the local and sub-regional requirements. Extraction is no longer under the control of local landowners taking out modest volumes of limestone and aggregate. Large companies have taken over ownership of the quarries extraction and are maximising output for maximum short/medium term gain. This requires much more effective minerals control by RCC using Rutland based, professional minerals officers and enforcement officers. Professionally prepared policies are required for such topics as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inspections and Enforcement</li> <li>2. Management of Extraction rates</li> <li>3. How much quarrying should be permitted in Rutland</li> <li>4. Designating areas for future minerals extraction.</li> <li>5. Buffer zones and preferred quarrying locations</li> <li>6. Environment protection</li> <li>7. Restoration and biodiversity enhancement</li> <li>8. Transport impacts arising from Rutland quarries</li> <li>9. Site security boundaries and fencing.</li> </ol>
3949	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		Objective 11: Should be reformed towards meeting primarily Rutland's needs with limitations on our contribution to sub-regional requirements. Local Aggregate Assessments must be enforced in practice.
3882	Ryhall Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [435]		<p>In general: mineral extractions in the county should have limits set on how much aggregate can be quarried.</p> <p>Concerns with regards to noise, dust, traffic volumes, Impact on residential property and public amenities are a concern. There are a large number of quarries for a small county the impact should be recognised. Buffer zones and environment protections are not always adequate.</p>
3849	Sally Renner [1124]		In an effort to tackle climate change and setting out to be net zero carbon, we should move away from the extraction/reliance of minerals and look to more environmentally building materials including reduction/reuse.
3768	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		No specific comment, however, Historic England would welcome early informal involvement in any consultations on potential site allocations. We would also stress the importance of a local stone supply for historic buildings.

3715	Greetham Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [418]		<p>The minerals resources in Rutland are concentrated almost exclusively in the eastern half of the county, therefore this area experiences the worst pollution as a consequence.</p> <p>On an annual basis the Council prepares an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) which calculates provision figures on the basis of average aggregate sales over a ten-year rolling period, factoring in relevant local information. It also calculates a three-year average sales to assist in identifying emerging trends. This is an annual re-appraisal of the minerals extraction requirements, and is up to date. Any Quarry Operator applying for permission to extract minerals refers to these rates in their Planning Applications. However, in a recent application by Mick George on the North West Extension to Greetham Quarry, the application refers to extracting 3 times the last LAA agreed extraction rate.</p> <p>Part of the application appraisal by the Minerals Planning Authority should identify discrepancies between Local Plan/LAA rates and those applied for, and any non-adherence to these documents should be brought to the attention of the applicant immediately before proceeding. Once an application has been permitted, there is no evidence that Minerals Planning Authorities are monitoring extraction rates on an annual basis, in fact when asked, they confirmed that there was no method by which this could be achieved. Conditions applied to minerals planning applications will take into account noise, dust and traffic volumes that the extraction rate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Regular, verified extraction rate reporting from quarry operators to be agreed prior to planning permission being granted.</li> <li>2 The applied for extraction rate should agree with the Local Plan/LAA agreed extraction rate and if it doesn't the application should be referred back to the operator.</li> </ol>
3682	Rutland Quarry Forum [1117]	Rutland Quarry Forum (David Hodson) [113]	<p>The minerals resources in Rutland are concentrated almost exclusively in the eastern half of the county, therefore this area experiences the worst pollution as a consequence.</p> <p>On an annual basis the Council prepares an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) which calculates provision figures on the basis of average aggregate sales over a ten year rolling period, factoring in relevant local information. It also calculates a three year average sales to assist in identifying emerging trends. This is an annual re-appraisal of the minerals extraction requirements, and is up to date.</p> <p>Any Quarry Operator applying for permission to extract minerals refers to these rates in their Planning Applications. However in a recent application by Mick George on the North West Extension to Greetham Quarry, the application refers to extracting 3 times the last LAA agreed extraction rate. Part of the application appraisal by the Minerals Planning Authority should identify discrepancies between Local Plan/LAA rates and those applied for, and any non-adherence to these documents</p>

			<p>should be brought to the attention of the applicant immediately before proceeding.</p> <p>Once an application has been permitted, there is no evidence that Minerals Planning Authorities are monitoring extraction rates on an annual basis, in fact when asked, they confirmed that there was no method by which this could be achieved.</p> <p>Conditions applied to minerals planning applications will take into account noise, dust and traffic volumes that the extraction rate</p> <p>Policies needed to address the above</p> <p>1 Regular, verified extraction rate reporting from quarry operators to be agreed prior to planning permission being granted.</p> <p>2 The applied for extraction rate should agree with the Local Plan/LAA agreed extraction rate and if it doesn't the application should be referred back to the operator.</p>
3572	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		<p>At some stage there will be a requirement to upgrade the A1 to motorway standard which will require a large amount of limestone. Provision should be made for this material to be easily accessed and directly from the A1 rather from along rural side roads.</p> <p>This should also be a requirement for all quarries in the County to provide internal roads which access the principal County roads A1, A43, A47, A606 and A6003. A good example of this is the Wakerley Quarry haul road to the A43, whereas the proposed Greetham Quarry does not and is close to residential areas.</p> <p>All quarries should have no works closer than 800 m from built up areas or PLDs</p>
3565	Market Overton Neighbourhood Planning Group (Andy Williamson) [262]		No
3375	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		No. Appy national standards.
3274	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		Consider the quality of materials required for particular developments so that the use of recycled materials can be maximised.
3166	Mr Roger Banks [1056]		No
3056	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		RCC must obviously follow the requirements of Section 17 of NPPF 2021 regarding mineral extraction. However, since this Local Plan covers the period to 2041, RCC might want to consider the demand for

			<p>cement products in that period and the subsequent effect on demand for aggregates. I have commented more on this in the next section (Section 52), but in principle the manufacture of concrete products has a VAST carbon footprint. The cement industry is responsible for about 8% of global carbon dioxide emissions, more than double those from flying or shipping. If it were a country its yearly pollution would only be topped by the US and China. Therefore the future of Ketton Cement works and the aggregates that supply it should be a major consideration in the new Local Plan. It is quite likely that the failure of previous Local Plans to address the carbon footprint at Ketton Cement Works may, by itself, be the reason that Rutland has performed worse on climate change than the whole of the UK over 16 of the past 17 years (Fig 6.1 and 6.2 in SA document)</p>
2911	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		<p>Expand Ketton Cement Works opencast mining East towards Edith Weston and West towards Stamford and plan to utilise the mined areas for potential industrial units and road infrastructure to connect through to the A1 for North/South distribution. The plant and wildlife biodiversity of the remnant land should be retained as a contrast to the rest of Rutland - this can already be viewed when walking the Hereward way from Ketton to Empingham.</p>
2863	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		<p>CPRE supports the views of its member and quarry advocate Cliff Bacon and his Greetham based quarry group. The group have submitted their views on what policies and protection is required for the future. CPRE Rutland supports their written submission.</p>
2805	Barrow parish meeting (Parish Council Representative) [401]		<p>Amount of traffic on small country roads.</p>
2670	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		<p>Road network</p>
2506	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		<p>Rutland's road network is already stretched and any large scale mineral extraction must not add to this. It is critical that the important task of extracting and transporting these minerals doesn't cause a blight on local communities because of heavy lorries.</p>
2407	BCH UK Ltd. [552]	Hughes Craven Ltd. (Mr Oliver Craven, Director) [551]	<p>Given the relatively limited number of mineral sites within the County, which are split across a variety of operations (crushed rock aggregate, buildings stone, minerals for cement manufacture), it is considered impractical to accurately predict the supply and demand for mineral resources within the County.</p> <p>In order to be able to meet future demands, and avoid any potential shortfalls, it is considered important that any adopted policies should have sufficient flexibility to allow for unforeseen demand to be met.</p>

2370	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		Rutland's road network is already stretched and any large scale mineral extraction must not add to this. It is critical that the important task of extracting and transporting these minerals doesn't cause a blight on local communities because of heavy lorries.
2330	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		It is important that mineral reserves are not sterilised by development (particularly limestone in this area which is of national importance) even if the mineral is not required until after the plan period. Minerals are a natural resource and are finite. Minerals will be required for use by future generations
2280	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		Rutland's road network is already stretched and any large scale mineral extraction must not add to this. It is critical that the important task of extracting and transporting these minerals doesn't cause a blight on local communities because of heavy lorries.
2151	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Overdevelopment in certain areas of Rutland
2115	Mr George Bretten [995]		No
2108	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Recycling of suitable materials must be a priority over quick, easy and lazy decision making regarding mineral extraction. Recycling and re-use of materials for highways, for example, is already a reality and commonly used in Europe. RCC should fully encourage this innovation.
2030	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		No
1985	Mr Malcolm Forbes [988]		Minimisation/elimination of environmental impacts must have the highest priority
1928	Mr John Donaldson [986]		No
1799	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		No
1719	Barry Hobbs [646]		Rutlands infrastructure is not adequate to support additional demand
1628	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		There should be consideration of re-using materials from brown field sites - urban quarrying. Use more renewables in building materials - bricks from waste.
1603	Mr Neil Robertson [846]		No
1378	Normanton Parish Meeting (Mr Christopher Renner, This is my		Aim for carbon neutral cement production. Highest standard of reclamation after mineral extraction. Careful and efficient monitoring of compliance of planning conditions.

	personal view from Normanton Parish Meeting) [109]		
1190	Mrs Sarah Ford [922]		No
996	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		Not knowledgeable enough to comment
959	Mrs Gillian Hodson [896]		There should be a buffer zone preventing quarries coming closer than 500 metres to residential and community facilities.
926	Mr Keuth Baker [899]		NO
913	Rutland Quarry Forum (David Hodson) [113]		There should be a buffer zone between new quarries and existing residential and Community Facilities of 500 metres to protect the health and well being of residents.
860	Mr John Sharp [897]		no
802	Mr Paul Topham [894]		No
740	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>We support the most sustainable approach to supply and demand that will limit the potential impacts on the natural environment and local communities, including potential pollution on human and environmental health.</p> <p>We also support the approach to prepare an assessment; this should consider the proposed planned growth for Rutland. Assessments for the most sustainable locations for the supply of minerals should consider the hierarchy of internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites in accordance with The Framework, including water-based assets (paragraph 175).</p>
722	Mrs Hilary Smith [868]		Minerals are important. Quarrying should be kept away from buildings as far as possible. If minerals are present new build should be avoided if impacted later
669	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		Local limestone resources for new builds and restoration demand a continued provision of quarrying. Collyweston slate availability is essential if existing listed buildings with this roofing are to be affordably maintained.
548	Mrs Jayne Williams [857]		Do not allow mineral extraction close to housing.
513	Mr Nigel Roberts [705]		None
468	Richard Camp [155]		Quarrying should be proportionate and not excessive for a small rural county
381	Martin Shewry [755]		Quarrying is a long tradition in Rutland. Hanson is a major employer. It has followed a responsible long-term plan to continue its work in Rutland.
274	Mr Christopher Jordan [712]		The mineral safeguarding areas should be maintained, Parts of the airfield at North Luffenham is a prime example of land that need protecting for the future production of cement in Rutland

268	Mr Christopher Jordan [712]		The mineral safeguarding areas should be maintained, Parts of the airfield at North Luffenham is a prime example of land that need protecting for the future.
236	Miss Catherine Wymer [771]		losing will to live filling this in. This is all far too long winded, most people won't do this!!!
4055	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		Also given the size of Rutland, the strategic objective 11 (relating to ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals) should be reformed around meeting primarily Rutland's needs with some contribution to sub-regional requirements.
1236	Mrs Hannah Williams [925]		<p>Strategic Objective 11: States "ensure a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local needs whilst taking account of impacts on environments and local communities." I would argue that we as a county are unable to 'ensure' something such as this, and could only 'endeavour' to best use our resources.</p> <p>In addition, I would instead put the impact on the wider environment and local communities first. It is very easy to see examples of short-termism in our past, and therefore we should be careful and ensure sufficient scrutiny of these decisions. I would write: "Ensure proper scrutiny to safeguard and minimise impact on both environment and local communities of our obligation [or, in seeking] to provide a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local needs."</p>

Rep id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	52 Do you have any views on how the most efficient and sustainable use of minerals resources can be secured through the Local Plan?
--------	-----------------	-------	---

4084	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		The main emphasis should be on reuse and recycling to ensure, for example, that every opportunity is taken to reuse recycled aggregate and historic building stone.
3977	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		The Local Aggregate Assessment which should be updated every year is the key to this question. Who prepares it and where is it available for public examination? An emphasis on the re-use and re-cycling of mineral resources is key to ensure that every opportunity is taken to re-use recycled aggregate and historic building stone.
3850	Sally Renner [1124]		The use of minerals resources is not sustainable so it isn't possible. Greater opportunities for recycling/reuse.
3376	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		Any consideration needs to take account of the essential rural nature of Rutland.
3057	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		<p>The cement industry is responsible for about 8% of global carbon dioxide emissions, more than double those from flying or shipping. If it were a country its yearly pollution would only be topped by the US and China. Therefore Ketton Cement works and the aggregates that supply it should be a major consideration in the new Local Plan. It is quite likely that the failure of previous Local Plans to address the carbon footprint at Ketton Cement Works may, by itself, be the reason that Rutland has performed worse on climate change than the whole of the UK over 16 of the past 17 years (Fig 6.1 and 6.2 in SA document)</p> <p>The easiest first step would be for Ketton Cement works to reduce its use of fossil fuel even further by both enlarging its solar farm, adding a wind turbine and energy storage (probably batteries). In keeping with government strategy, any excess energy generated could be sold locally at advantageous prices. Beyond that, there are also strategies in existence to reduce the use of primary aggregate that go beyond the "recycled and secondary" aggregates proposed in the preamble. Please note that NO reliance should be put on carbon capture in this planning as this - still - is completely unproven technology at scale.</p>
2912	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Not enough knowledge of the extraction process to comment
2864	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		See previous question and submission by Greetham Quarry Group.

2408	BCH UK Ltd. [552]	Hughes Craven Ltd. (Mr Oliver Craven, Director) [551]	<p>The benefits of the co-location of mineral extraction and facilities for the recycling of Construction, Demolition and Excavation wastes should be recognised.</p> <p>Similarly it should be recognised that, in order to make best use of the available resource, building stone quarries may also be capable of producing significant quantities of aggregates (secondary aggregates). Furthermore, where the target mineral lies beneath clay overburden, there may be the potential for the sale of clays for engineering/flood defence works.</p>
2331	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		Secondary minerals (recycled) should always be used in preference to virgin minerals where possible.
2152	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Get a full time RCC Minerals Officer with Experience (yes a cost) and then make sure that National Assets are not sterilised by development. Prioritise locality and availability longer term by using a 50-year timescale for any such requirement
2109	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Please see previous response.
1629	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		We will not get to be carbon neutral when Castle Cement - Hansons - are still limestone quarrying.
1379	Normanton Parish Meeting (Mr Christopher Renner, This is my personal view from Normanton Parish Meeting) [109]		Maximise re-use of resources.
741	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		It would be helpful for the Local Plan to set out that any use of recycled aggregate may require a permit, or exemption for use.
670	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		Ketton cement is an important local employer and it's products are essential. It's ability to open new streams of raw materials is important.
382	Martin Shewry [755]		On a case-by-case basis, under usual RCC approval processes.
307	Mr Graham Layne [801]		Given that the recycling sites take waste that can be used for CDE is it not possible to expand this facility to provide additional income for the county.
269	Mr Christopher Jordan [712]		Ensure a detailed assessment is made of all mineral resources in the county.

Rep id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Q53 Safeguarding mineral resources
3978	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		<p>1. We should only be safeguarding minerals in Rutland sufficient for our own local use.</p> <p>2. Mineral safeguarding areas should be defined to cover only the extent of the minerals deposits themselves and should not include any built-up area.</p> <p>3. There needs to be enforceable policies relating to buffer zones around the extraction of minerals in order to protect existing housing development. Best practice suggests that a minimum 500 metre buffer zone is enforced between all quarry extension proposals and existing housing development. Local Plan needs clear enforceable policies to secure this.</p> <p>4. New minerals policies need to be professionally prepared using professional minerals officers to impose a robust approach to minerals control with clear and enforceable limitations of scale and safeguarding measures in accordance with current legislation.</p>
3804	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		<p>Buffer zones should be greater between built areas/woods/SSSIs</p> <p>Restoration should be of a higher standard and closely monitored</p>
3769	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		<p>Any areas of Safeguarding and buffer zones should have adequate levels of assessment undertaken, similar to other types of allocations.</p>
3716	Greetham Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [418]		<p>a. No comment</p> <p>b. The consultation paper considers proposals for using buffer zones to protect mineral reserves from sterilisation through other surface developments. We consider the use of adequate buffer zones important also in protecting human health and the environment from the adverse impacts of quarrying activities.</p> <p>Mineral Industry guidance (IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning 2016) identifies from sporadic Industry information available that amenity dust and PM 2.5 and 10 emissions to be recorded up to 400m from site.</p> <p>In order to provide reasonable protection to the local population it is appropriate that mineral extraction applications be restricted to 500m distance from any existing residential and/or built up areas.</p> <p>c. The mineral extraction industry within Rutland is limited to limestone extraction and thus the limits detailed in the response to question 53b should apply solely.</p>

			d. No comment
3683	Rutland Quarry Forum [1117]	Rutland Quarry Forum (David Hodson) [113]	<p>a. No comment</p> <p>b. The consultation paper considers proposals for using buffer zones to protect mineral reserves from sterilisation through other surface developments. We consider the use of adequate buffer zones important also in protecting human health and the environment from the adverse impacts of quarrying activities.</p> <p>Mineral Industry guidance (IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for Planning 2016) identifies from sporadic Industry information available that amenity dust and PM 2.5 and 10 emissions to be recorded up to 400m from site.</p> <p>In order to provide reasonable protection to the local population it is appropriate that mineral extraction applications be restricted to 500m distance from any existing residential and/or built up areas.</p> <p>c. The mineral extraction industry within Rutland is limited to limestone extraction and thus the limits detailed in the response to question 53b should apply solely.</p> <p>d. No comment</p>
3575	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		<p>a Limestone for the construction and cement industry should be protected from all residential development.</p> <p>b It should exclude built up areas and an adequate buffer</p> <p>c A minimum of 800 metres from the nearest potential workings to any residential property regardless of type of mineral. Where the extraction process is more noisier or dustier than normal, additional buffer should be provided</p> <p>d The processing plant at Ketton cement should be safeguarded</p>
3571	Market Overton Neighbourhood Planning Group (Andy Williamson) [262]		<p>a) Quarrying</p> <p>b) Exclude built up area</p> <p>c) Use buffer zones and safeguarding areas buffer zone 3 miles</p>

3341	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	The document considers buffer zones to protect mineral reserves from sterilisation through other surface developments, however then use of adequate buffer zones is vitally important in protecting human health and the environment from the adverse effects of quarrying activities. In order to protect the local population, and the environment, it is essential that mineral extraction applications be restricted to 500m distance from any existing residential area, built up area or environmentally sensitive habitat.
3275	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		<p>a - Limestone which is of national importance, but also any Colleyweston stone (as of local importance to use in replacement/repair of older traditional buildings and sand and gravel reserves.</p> <p>b - Yes and it should include the reserves not just for the plan period but also for future generations. These reserves should be protected completely as minerals are a finite resource.</p> <p>c - Yes, there should be buffer zones to avoid any other new development being carried out with the potential of the reserve failing at planning due to the impact on that new development</p>
3248	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		Objective 11 is important as the county has reserves of nationally important minerals. These reserves should be protected, not just for the forecast use in the plan period, but beyond for the benefit of future generations. In considering this even current unviable reserves should be protected as they will become viable in the future.
3220	Mr Martin Lester [1058]		b Exclude built up areas
3184	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		The need for minerals is clearly explained in NPPF 2021, but it is an old fashioned view based on a continuous and substantial road building and infrastructure programme by the government. It makes no allowance for modern techniques of housebuilding and the move away from using cement products wherever possible. RCC quite rightly extolls the beauty of Rutland and turning large parts of our tiny county into quarries is not consistent with this. Apart from standing up for Rutland, RCC need to comply with paragraphs 210 to 214 inclusive of NPPF 2021 with regard to a) On no account whatsoever should RCC permit fracking or any the attempt to recover oil or gas b) MSAs should exclude built up areas c) There should be no buffer zones around MSAs. RCC should have a policy to keep mineral extraction rates at current levels or lower for the life of this local plan. Before 2041, the world will be reducing the extraction of minerals as part of trying to keep the planet habitable, and it would be unfortunate if the current RCC team had put in place strategies to destroy swathes of the county in the meantime. RCC should support any project for carbon capture in old mine workings to give this unlikely and totally unproven technology every chance of success.

2913	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		<p>a. Limestone</p> <p>b. Exclude built up areas and create a plan to mine, then utilise the mined areas for industrial and leisure areas</p> <p>c. No. used defined MSAs to include any required buffer zones</p>
2865	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		<p>a) Existing quarries</p> <p>b) Exclude built up areas</p> <p>c) CPRE supports the view of the Greetham based quarry group on this matter.</p>
2698	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		<p>a, none</p> <p>b, exclude built up areas</p> <p>c, yes. Wider buffers for more intrusive extraction</p> <p>d, St George's barracks buffered from proposed housing</p>
2412	Hughes Craven Ltd. (Mr Oliver Craven, Director) [551]		<p>a) Mineral resources to be safeguarded should include limestones (both for aggregate and building stone purposes) and those minerals required to support cement manufacture. Given the absence of any significant brick manufacture or sand and gravel extraction within the County it is not considered necessary to safeguard these minerals. All active minerals infrastructure should also be safeguarded.</p> <p>b) MSAs should exclude built up areas. It may also be appropriate to apply a buffer zone to built up areas (as any mineral resource present may, in effect already be sterilised by their proximity to built up areas).</p> <p>c) Buffer zones should be applied - suggest 250m for all mineral resources.</p>
2409	BCH UK Ltd. [552]	Hughes Craven Ltd. (Mr Oliver Craven, Director) [551]	<p>a) Mineral resource to be safeguarded should include limestones (for both aggregate and building stone purposes) and those minerals required to support cement production.</p> <p>b) Mineral Safeguarding Areas should exclude built up areas.</p> <p>c) Buffer zones should be applied around all Mineral Safeguarding Areas. A 250m buffer zone is considered to be appropriate for all mineral types.</p>
2332	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		<p>Limestone should, particularly, be protected and safeguarded as should any reserves of other hardstone and gravel and clay.</p> <p>Yes, the entire mineral reserve should be safeguarded even if a) it will not be extracted until after the plan period and b) even if not currently viable to extract</p> <p>Buffer zones should be applied appropriate to the type of mineral and its depth of working. Any development near to a potential site for mineral extraction should allow for the fact that it may be</p>

			extracted and developed with buffer zones to ensure minimise the impact of the development and minimise the potential of that development preventing the mineral extraction
2202	Dr H Crowden [1000]		a All b include c 1 mile
2153	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Keep the Ketton location. Exclude built up areas Buffer zone 500m
2117	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Buffer zones should be maximised in all cases. Safeguarding the environment during and following mineral extraction must surely be of the highest priority for RCC.
2032	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		c) The widest buffer zones should be applied to ensure the safety of human health. There is much research done on this matter and one assumes different substances will require different approaches. We owe it to our children to be cautious and protect their health.
2001	Ms Rosemary Harris [984]		Mineral Safeguarding Areas should exclude built up areas.
1986	Mr Malcolm Forbes [988]		Buffer zones are vital and should be determined on a case by case basis. The minimisation/elimination of environmental impacts should be the highest priority.
1801	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		A. All  b. Full extent  c. yes buffer zones, no distinction in buffer around different mineral resources
1674	Lincolnshire County Council (Mr PHILIP HUGHES, Strategic Planning Manager) [968]		At present Rutland does not safeguard sand and gravel deposits on the basis they are neither worked nor have economic value. However, given that Rutland is dependent on imports, this matter should be given further consideration. Even if they do not have economic value now, with transportation costs rising this may change in the future. Furthermore, working these resources would provide a more sustainable way of meeting local needs.
1557	Whissendine Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [447]		There should be buffer zones and the zones should be specific rather than generic
1380	Normanton Parish Meeting (Mr Christopher		There seem to be very large amounts of limestone available so no need to safeguard the whole area to the detriment of other development.

	Renner, This is my personal view from Normanton Parish Meeting) [109]		Dust and noise are a hazard with mineral extraction and suitable buffer distances need to protect the local environment.
1191	Mrs Sarah Ford [922]		I can't comment; insufficient knowledge
961	Mrs Gillian Hodson [896]		c There should be a buffer zone around mineral resources both in terms of building houses too close to the resources and also not allowing extraction of minerals to take place too close to existing houses, community buildings, etc.
928	Mr Keuth Baker [899]		B
862	Mr John Sharp [897]		a) ketton cement b) all areas c) zones should ensure housing is protected
742	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		c) We support the inclusion of buffer zones to ensure that these sites are considered in the decision-making process for other types of development.
671	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		Limestone building stone, limestone for cement manufacture and Collyweston slates are essential requirements. But they should be distant from residential areas.
383	Martin Shewry [755]		a. Limestone / cement work b. Full c. Buffer zones should apply where local opinion demands
308	Mr Graham Layne [801]		a. All resources. locally produced minerals reduces transportation miles and there production can have more environmental controls applied. b&c built up areas should be excluded if they are not being considered for redevelopment as with St Georges and these should be protected by a buffer zone to reduce the impact on adjacent communities i.e. as experienced by Ketton residents over many years

Rep id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	55. Do you have any comments on how the Local Plan should seek to meet Rutland's waste management needs?
--------	-----------------	-------	--

4233	Natural England (Roslyn Deeming, Senior Planning Adviser) [236]		Question 54 additional comments: Natural England suggests that this option to set out specific policies for managing the impacts of mineral development on the wider environment and the restoration/after-use of mineral workings would be preferable as it would offer greater protection for natural assets. The policy should incorporate new issues arising from the Environment Act such as Biodiversity Net Gain and how restored minerals sites would integrate into the Nature Recovery Network and their potential to provide Green/Blue Infrastructure.
4087	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		The Local Plan policies should be geared around providing a framework and help to residents and businesses to gradually move as far up the hierarchy as possible, focusing on prevention and recycling to ensure that the requirement for waste disposal processes is minimised over time.
3980	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		The Local Plan policies should be geared around providing a framework and help to residents and businesses to gradually move as far up the hierarchy as possible, focusing on prevention and recycling to ensure that the requirement for waste disposal processes is minimised over time.
3578	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		Provide in the Local Plan for the provision of a local Waste Transfer Station
3573	Market Overton Neighbourhood Planning Group (Andy Williamson) [262]		No
3414	Mr Adam Cade [1078]		A wider range of waste should be stored at civic sites. Rutland residents should be able to purchase for a small price some selected and re-usable waste.
3379	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		No. National standards apply.
3343	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	Collect food waste separately.  Provide public bins that have separate compartments for recycling and other waste.  Initiate a scheme to supply composting bins to households at low cost.  Education - rubbish roadshows/'clinics' in libraries, sports and other clubs, village halls, youth clubs,

			schools etc
			Promote and support a mobile refill shop eg Refill Revolution, visiting Rutland villages.
3033	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]		Waste management is a key element in reducing climate impact (Issue 1). The 'Vision' states that 'Rutland will fundamentally redefine its relationship with waste by reducing the amount that is consumed and then thrown away in the county'. This could be rather more clearly reflected in the plan than is evident from this consultation document.  The costs of exporting waste (out of county) to be recycled or disposed of must also be a consideration.
2966	Mr Brian Grady [1052]		Increase the opening hours of Cottesmore Waste Recycling Centre
2915	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Make communication of policies, rule and methods to the public a priority. Currently there is not enough information and so too much is left to the individual household to decide, which leads to apathy, waste and incorrect recycling.
2867	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		Continue existing policies and improve where possible.
2809	Barrow parish meeting (Parish Council Representative) [401]		No.
2696	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		Better marketing of recycling policies and rules, transport measures to be published
2671	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		A bigger variety of recycling bins for private properties
2515	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		No. We do not feel qualified to comment on this question.
2334	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		RCC should continue to consider ways to minimise, reuse, recycle waste and treat beneficially (e.g., anaerobic digestion and perhaps supplying heat/electricity to any neighbouring community
2155	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Is there now a duty to cooperate under NPPF on this matter?
2122	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Waste management and its environmental impact should be managed using the most up to date, efficient methods.

2034	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		No
1803	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		Lets look at copying the Spanish way of dealing with waste - households do not have individual bins there are rows of different category bins in each street so residents have to split/sort their waste and take it out to the bins. Why not try this with all new developments and then roll out to existing housing if it works.
1723	Barry Hobbs [646]		No comment no qualified to answer
1675	Lincolnshire County Council (Mr PHILIP HUGHES, Strategic Planning Manager) [968]		For waste, the document makes no reference to the principle of self-sufficiency. It does, however, acknowledge that “Most of the waste produced in Rutland is exported to surrounding authorities where it undergoes processing in preparation for recycling and reuse (including composting and inert recycling), is otherwise treated, or disposed of to landfill”  This suggests that the existing policy is too restrictive and that an alternative approach is needed to encourage and facilitate net self-sufficiency. Whether Rutland goes for site specific or criteria-based policies will make little difference if those policies are too restrictive.  Unfortunately, the supporting text to these questions does not indicate that Rutland is considering a radically different approach. Furthermore, the final paragraph (3.14.19) seems to suggest that their main approach will be to examine capacity elsewhere.
1660	Lincolnshire County Council (Mr PHILIP HUGHES, Strategic Planning Manager) [968]		Strategic Objective 10 is very weak with respect to making provision for waste management and disposal – particularly given that Rutland currently exports most of its waste. The objective should include a commitment to seek net self-sufficiency in waste management in line with the NPPG. Just because Rutland is a small county doesn’t mean it shouldn’t play its part in dealing with waste.
1518	Mr Andrew Lunn [689]		More education on recycling and food waste.  Any new developments must have adequate space to store bins and that are not unsightly to the neighbourhood.
1382	Normanton Parish Meeting (Mr Christopher Renner, This is my personal view from Normanton Parish Meeting) [109]		Consider if an educational element could be incorporated to train people to minimise all waste especially food waste and littering.
1000	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		Cut plastic use as much as possible in shops and packaging and discourage use of plastic bottle
930	Mr Keuth Baker [899]		NO

864	Mr John Sharp [897]		no
842	Mrs Angela Hawkins [898]		No comments to make
744	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>Question 54 additional comments: We support Option A to include specific policies to manage the impacts of mineral development on the wider environment, and the restoration/after-use of mineral workings. The Plan should ensure that it is proactively supporting opportunities to not only prevent any unacceptable impacts, but seek to protect and enhance the natural environment, including water-based environments.</p> <p>This should include criteria to ensure that minerals are worked in ways that do not increase flood risk. Furthermore, despite the flood risk vulnerability classifications, the sequential test must be passed and the sequential approach must be applied to ensure lower risk sites are developed ahead of higher risk sites.</p> <p>Restoration policies should set a positive approach for the after-use and restoration of mineral workings to meet high environmental standards through a variety of opportunities to protect, restore, and enhance natural and historic landscapes, encourage wildlife, safeguards soil resources and the best and most versatile agricultural land, encourage woodlands, leisure, and recreation. They should require proposals to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure which can provide a multitude of benefits to both people and wildlife. This should include protecting and enhancing the river corridors and associated wetlands and floodplain biodiversity.</p> <p>The policies for restoration and after-use should be aspirational and seek betterment through a reduction in flood risk where possible, for example, this could include through increased flood storage capacity and a reduction in surface water run-off. There is a significant opportunity to ensure the policies will take a proactive approach to mitigate and adapt to climate change, alongside other requirements such as the forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategies and enhancing opportunities for biodiversity net gain, for example this could include river restoration works. The Environment Act (2021) sets the legal framework for development to achieve a minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity. We recommend that consideration should be given to the sustainability of the pumping of water in low level restoration schemes as this could be energy intensive.</p> <p>Question 55: We support the approach to carry out an evidence base study to understand how much</p>

		<p>waste will need to be managed now and in the future; this should consider the proposed level of growth in Rutland. We are pleased to see the reference to the waste hierarchy that prioritises prevention followed by re-use and recycling, and disposal as the least desirable option. We would welcome reference to the circular economy approach to the use of resources.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.14.17 recognises that communities and business should take responsibility for their waste in line with the 'proximity principle'; where possible, the Local Plan should seek to manage waste as close to the source as possible to reduce the distance waste is transported, which provides both economic and environmental benefits.</p> <p>We recommend a target for waste management is included to meet the aspirations of the 25 Year Environment Plan to 'minimise waste, reuse materials as much as we can and manage materials at the end of their life to minimise the impact on the environment'. It should plan for waste infrastructure, including wastewater, and recognise the significant contribution restored mineral and waste sites can make to green and blue infrastructure requirements.</p>
673	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]	<p>We must maximise recycling through every feasible way ... the existing 3 bin system with fortnightly collections works well ...but there should be an electrical collection system perhaps quarterly and a free large item service as travelling long distances to recycling centres is expensive and wasteful of fuel ... and this would diminish fly tipping</p>
517	Mr Nigel Roberts [705]	<p>Enforce food recycling</p>
385	Martin Shewry [755]	<p>Please keep it within economic bounds and avoid expensive schemes to further burden the rates</p>
310	Mr Graham Layne [801]	<p>People need to be made more aware of waste management. WE are lucky that most processing is carried out out of county. This needs to be publicised more and even using landfill sites within the county to promote even lower levels of waste generation.</p>

Rep id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Question 58 Do you have any additional suggestions or comments for addressing minerals and waste requirements in the Local Plan?
3930	Anglian Water (Darl Sweetland, Spatial Planning Manager) [234]		<p>3.15.3 Our Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP – currently at consultation) and our Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP – to be consulted on in November) set out how we will invest to support planned growth in the Anglian region. Expansion of strategic network and treatment</p>

		<p>assets is funded by customers through bills regulated by Ofwat. Developers pay for connections to new homes and into a central pot to support the wider upgrade of the network. Anglian Water would want to ensure that development makes best use of existing water infrastructure to reduce the carbon impact of growth and to reduce the costs to customers and developers of growth.</p> <p>3.15.4 We welcome continued support for SUDS as this reduces the amount of surface water requiring wastewater treatment.</p> <p>3.15.8 Anglian Water considers that at this stage in the Plan the Council has the opportunity to plan for growth through assessing the available infrastructure across all sectors in line with the sustainability hierarchy.</p>
3580	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]	We should identify and allocate sites with buffer zones for waste management facilities
3194	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]	RCC does well on some recycling at point of use: the RCC grey bin accepts various plastics that are often not accepted at kerbside collections (assuming it is all actually recycled). Other stuff is not so good, for example, not having a waste food collection, despite RCC sending out information that waste food accounted for 51% - over half – of what is currently put in black bins. Come on RCC, join the dots! Your target of zero waste involves pushing waste up the Waste Hierarchy, and so much of that is “training” the public. RCC needs to create a much higher profile for waste in households if it is to succeed, and this is obviously not a welcome message for the affluent middle class that form the majority of the population of Rutland. However, at a time when most households are struggling with their budgets, a “waste less” message would probably be appropriate and acceptable to all. Reducing/recycling ALL waste food reduces the size of the hole in the ground required for landfill by half as well, and this MUST be a five year (2027) target for RCC. This would significantly remove the demand for landfill and makes the decisions in Qu 56 & 57 much easier. The household waste centres are also good: always clean and tidy and with exceptionally helpful staff (Cottesmore, haven’t used Luffenham). One small but growing issue, is compostable bags and magazine wraps, food containers, vegetable based “styrene” packing chips in delivery boxes etc, for which there is no recycling provision. Many industries are moving to this material to be “green”, only for it to fail at the recycling stage, which is absurd.
2341	Mr Murdo Ross [890]	Recognise that many disused quarries (eg. Thistleton) are also of historical significance based upon finds.
2157	Mr Norman Milne [996]	An obvious site for Sub Regional Waste disposal is Woolfox

2125	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Consult widely and identify expertise existing in Rutland to address these issues, thereby ensuring its relevance to this County
745	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>Question 56 additional comments: We are pleased to see reference to important criteria that should be used to assess sites to be included in Local Plans in paragraph 3.14.21. We recognise the benefits of identifying locations or introducing criteria-based policies to ensure future proposals for waste management are in the most appropriate and sustainable locations; the criteria should be developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Should a criteria-based policy be taken forward, it should ensure proposals protect the natural environment and seek to promote opportunities to integrate development with green and blue infrastructure, whilst achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity. Criteria should consider the risk of flooding from all sources; it is essential that development proposals should be appropriate to the flood zone to which it is located, taking account of the flood risk sequential test and exception test requirements, where appropriate.</p> <p>Criteria should seek to minimise impacts on surface and groundwater in terms of both water resources and quality for the lifetime of the development. Waste sites that are in inappropriate locations have the potential to cause pollution in local watercourses. An appropriate assessment should demonstrate that there will be no increase in risk resulting from the proposed waste activity. We advise that any proposals for new waste facilities should be situated away from the main population to reduce the potential risk of receptor disturbance or complaints, in addition to consideration human and environmental health.</p> <p>We object to Option C; this approach would not be acceptable to achieve sustainability objectives, to proactively address need, or set out clear requirements for future proposals. It is important that the policy approach is clear and provides transparency to local communities, the applicant and decision-maker.</p> <p>Question 57 additional comments: We support Option A, to include specific policies for managing the impacts of waste development on the wider environment. This is important to acknowledge the potential risk to the environment and local community and to set out how this will be managed or mitigated. For example, is important to recognise the potential risk to the environment such as the need to identify any residual groundwater risks; some activities may require an environmental permit.</p>

Question 58: The policy approach should ensure that minerals and waste proposals provide appropriate protection to aquifers and groundwater in sensitive locations to avoid potentially polluting activities being located in the most sensitive locations for groundwater. We recommend viewing the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection.

Furthermore, regard should be given to the Land Contamination: Risk Management; this sets the requirement for proposals on previously development land or brownfield land to require a preliminary risk assessment to assess the potential risk posed by contamination.

#### Waste

As recognised in the Scope and Issues document, the Local Plan must apply the waste hierarchy using the priority order of prevention, re-use, recycle, before considering other recovery or disposal options. Further information on the waste hierarchy in England can be found here: 'Guidance on applying the waste hierarchy'

Please note, the Environment Agency do not regulate non-waste activities, for example, activities carried out under the CL:ARE Code of Practice, however the Local Plan may set out what materials meet End of Waste or By-products criteria as defined by the Waste Framework Directive. Please see guidance 'Check if your material is waste'. This process could help ensure the Local Plan is being proactive to consider all potential elements of waste management.

If materials that are considered to potentially be waste are proposed to be used on site, we would expect the planning application to ensure it can comply with the exclusion from the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) (article 2(1) (c)) for the use of, 'uncontaminated soil and other naturally occurring material excavated in the course of construction activities...' in order for the material not to be considered as waste. Meeting these criteria will mean waste permitting requirements do not apply. Where the applicant cannot meet the criteria, they will be required to obtain the appropriate waste permit or exemption from the Environment Agency.

Where waste soil is to be exported from site it must be classified as either a Hazardous waste with the waste code 17-05-03 (soil and stones containing hazardous substances) or as a Non-Hazardous waste code 17-05-04 (soil and stones other than those mentioned in 17-05-03). This classification is carried out in accordance with the guidance provided by the Environment Agency's Waste classification technical guidance.

Other useful guidance documents that we recommend reviewing for waste include:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental permitting Guidance – The Waste Framework Directive</li> <li>• Legal definition of waste guidance</li> <li>• Using waste: Waste exemptions</li> <li>• Waste recovery plans and deposit for recovery permits</li> </ul> <p>The plan should steer any high-risk development proposals away from Source Protection Zones.</p>
387	Martin Shewry [755]	Please keep it within economic bounds and avoid expensive schemes to further burden the rates
312	Mr Graham Layne [801]	People need to be made more aware of the waste they generate. Landfill sites need to be visible to promote waste reduction