

South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Examination Action List

Matter 26 - Minerals

At the EiP Matter Session 26 – Minerals, the Inspector asked South Gloucestershire and Yate Town Councils to consider suggested changes that would overcome the Town Council's objections. This note has been prepared to set out the points of agreement and disagreement between the two parties.

South Gloucestershire Council has shared this paper with Yate Town Council.

Summary of objection(s)

Yate Town Council wishes to ensure that the Core Strategy makes appropriate reference to the Safeguarded Minerals Resource (as defined in the Minerals and Waste Plan 2002 (Examination Library Ref: LR6)), where this relates to the Yate area and in particular the North Yate New Neighbourhood. The Town Council wishes to see reference to the safeguarded minerals resource within paragraph 14.21 and the safeguarded minerals resource area added to Figure 12. The Town Council also wishes to have Figure 12 amended to show a wider green corridor on the eastern edge of the new neighbourhood to take account of, *inter alia*, the safeguarded minerals resource, or that reference is made in the supporting text for the need to carry out an assessment to defined the extent of the strategic GI corridor in the future SPD.

Points of Agreement

Both parties agree:

1. That the minerals resource area should be shown on Figure 12, and
2. The following suggested change to paragraph 14.21:

A strategic Green Infrastructure corridor will be retained along the eastern edge of the development, to protect the landscape setting and special separate identity of Yate Rocks and to protect occupiers of homes in the new neighbourhood from activities at Chipping Sodbury Quarry, as well as ~~protecting~~ safeguarding the operation of Chipping Sodbury Quarry the quarry and preventing mineral sterilisation (See Policy 1 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2002), The Minerals Resource Area is also illustratively displayed on Figure 12).

Points of Disagreement

The two parties are not able to reach agreement on the following:

1. A revision to Figure 12 to extend the strategic GI corridor further westwards, and

2. If 1 is not taken forward that a further revision to paragraph 14.21 is made to state that the strategic GI corridor will be defined in the SPD following further assessment(s).

South Gloucestershire Council considers that the changes proposed under the points of disagreement are unnecessary and would create inconsistencies with other paragraphs. Point 1, Figure 12 is clearly entitled as being for 'illustrative purposes only', it is not an allocations plan and the illustrative GI corridor already extends beyond the safeguarded mineral resource area. For the purposes of interpreting the intention of the policy the figure is considered adequate. Point 2, making reference to the content of the SPD in paragraph 14.21 is unnecessary as this is addressed within the policy, alongside the other policy requirements. To single out this one item and cross reference it to the SPD is unnecessary and would be inconsistent with the other paragraphs. The Council does not consider this change to be necessary, as this item and the other policy requirements, would need to be addressed through the SPD process, in accordance with the revised wording of policy CS31 (set out a suggested change).

South Gloucestershire Council
23rd July 2012.