

Main Matter 1: Spatial Strategy

Key Issue: Whether the Spatial Strategy accurately reflects the geology of Greater Manchester and the balance of environmental considerations.

1. Section 4 of the Submitted Minerals Plan (**SD001**), specifically paragraphs 4.43-4.56, sets out the Spatial Strategy for the Minerals Plan. A key element of the Spatial Strategy is that minerals can only be worked where they are found, and as such the geology of Greater Manchester is the key influence on the Spatial Strategy. The Spatial Strategy reflects the work undertaken to identify the Areas of Search for aggregates, and this work took account of BGS data, previous work to define Areas of Search undertaken to inform the 1989 Minerals Plan (see Appendix 1 of the Submitted Plan for details), and the submission of information from industry and landowners. As such the MWPU are confident that this accurately reflects the geology of Greater Manchester in relation to the provision of aggregate minerals.
2. Areas of Search have not been developed for non-aggregate minerals. The reason for this is that there is insufficient information available regarding the quality of minerals available outside the BGS data, and no information was submitted by industry to support the identification of Preferred Areas or site specific allocations for any mineral resource. Proposals for mineral extraction outside the Areas of Search which come forward in Greater Manchester would be considered as windfall sites and would be dealt with through the relevant policies within the Plan. All proposals for mineral development are required to show how they are in conformity with the Spatial Strategy and take account of the key planning and environmental criteria set out in Policy 1.
3. A number of interrelated aspects of the evidence base, government advice, the Plan's aims and objectives and the views of Stakeholders are reflected within the 4 key themes of the Spatial Strategy, these are set out below:
 - Places where there are opportunities to restore land beneficially;
 - Places without a sensitive natural or built environment and away from existing communities;

- Places accessible by sustainable modes of transport and close to the existing highway network; and
 - Places close to the end user.
4. Together these four principles address the need to provide for extraction and processing of minerals whilst protecting the environment and local communities.
 5. The Spatial Portrait in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.37 briefly sets out the picture for minerals development in Greater Manchester, the current apportionment figures for the period 2005-2020 and describes the main minerals found in Greater Manchester.
 6. This information, together with Map 2a provides the detail behind the Spatial Strategy for the Minerals Plan.
 7. Policy 1 of the Submitted Plan sets out the key planning and environmental criteria which must be considered by all proposals for minerals development. This list was developed from the methodology used to identify the areas of search for aggregates as set out in Paragraphs 4.12 - 4.21 of the Preferred Approach Report (**CDC011**).

Questions:

What is the Spatial Strategy which is referred to in Policy 4?

8. This is answered above.

Why were Areas of Search chosen over Allocations or Preferred Areas?

9. Despite 5 call for sites during the development of the Minerals Plan, no quantitative or qualitative evidence relating to mineral resources has been submitted by stakeholders to support the allocation of Preferred Areas or site specific allocations. The Greater Manchester Authorities do not have the resources to undertake borehole analysis; instead Areas of Search have been identified within the Plan and developed based on previous work (including the

Investigation into Mineral Resources in Greater Manchester, TD008) and BGS information (TD002).

Were economic factors taken into account in discarding resources from the Areas of Search?

10. The BGS resource map (**TD002**) provides details of mineral resources of current, or potential, economic interest and this was used to support work as part of the initial investigation into mineral resources in Greater Manchester (**TD008**). It was not used to assist in discarding resources from the Areas of Search.
11. Section 6, paragraphs 6.13-6.21 of this report discuss the economic criteria which was applied to borehole data held by the authority that was captured through work undertaken as part of the 1989 plan (the BORIS Data). This information was used to score the borehole data, however it was not used to exclude any information from the Areas of Search.
12. It is generally accepted by industry that the minerals remaining in Greater Manchester are of low quality and as such the main players have shown little interest in the area (see Appendix 1 of this statement for evidence of communication with mineral industry representatives on such issues), in a few cases withdrawing their interest prior to Publication of the Plan, leaving those minerals left to be exploited by smaller, local operators. However, those deposits which are extracted do have a local use and as such are seen as important to the local economy. Therefore the extent of the Areas of Search allocated within the Plan have not been reduced or amended to reflect the economic viability of the deposits.

Were planning and environmental criteria taken into account in assessing the Areas of Search, and if so, were some more heavily weighted than others?

13. As discussed above, Appendix 1 of the Submitted Plan provides detail on the methodology used to identify areas of search. As part of this work, 2 levels of constraints to mineral development were identified, category 1 constraints, which are considered to be absolute constraints which would prevent mineral development in normal circumstances, and category 2 constraints which include

those where the MPA would normally prefer mineral working not to take place. Category 2 constraints were not used as absolute constraints but have informed the development of the Areas of Search. The constraints are listed in paragraph 1.20 (page 63 of the submitted Plan). All category 1 constraints were given the same level of weighting, whilst category 2 were used to inform the development of the Areas of Search, again each was weighted the same.

14. For each Area of Search identified, a 250m buffer from the urban area was applied to protect amenity of neighbouring developments from the effects of quarrying.
15. Within the Submitted Plan Appendix 1 Paragraph 1.24 provides the final list of land excluded from the Areas of Search after all constraints had been applied.

APPENDIX 1

FILE NOTES:

COMMUNICATIONS WITH INDUSTRY IN RELATION TO CURRENT AND
FUTURE MINERAL INTERESTS ACROSS GREATER MANCHESTER

SPRING/SUMMER 2007

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Minerals Investigation
-----------------	------------------------

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	30.04.07
--------------------	------	--------------	----------

Site Visit		Phone Call		Meeting		Other (Please State)	X
-------------------	--	-------------------	--	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	---

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Trafford received some interest in a site with permission for clay extraction in 2003/04. This site is Jackson's brickworks in Flixton. Since the original permission, permissions for residential developments have been granted on two sides of the site making any future working pretty restricted.

Site to be considered as part of the mineral review work.

ACTIONS:

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Phone Call with Dennis McBride (Principle Planner, M&W, Wigan Council)
-----------------	--

JOB NUMBER:		DATE:	2.3.07
--------------------	--	--------------	--------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	---------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Asked Dennis about Technical Appendix to 1989 Minerals Plan. He said he remembers people going out to do boreholes for sand and gravel (I think these will be technical appendix 2). After GMC ended, GMGU inherited all this (including auger used for the boreholes and the landrover!). Dennis does not have appendix and he thinks that we must hold it somewhere.

Dennis said that there was no finding to carry out boreholes for coal.

As an aside, Dennis said that company called ARC who worked a sand quarry in Wigan at the time had taken areas of search to look at but decided there were no viable deposits in Wigan.

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Minerals Investigation
-----------------	------------------------

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	02.04.07
--------------------	------	--------------	----------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Mr Roberts of Broomhill Farm, Pilsworth, Heyworth (farmer/landowner) called after reading advert placed in Farmers Guardian. Called to say that borehole logs and survey done about 20 years ago (for old minerals plan?) and he believes the farm is included as area of search on old plan. He is going to dig out old records and map and send to GMGU. Mineral is Sand, and he though there may have been 1 million tonnes.

PH

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Minerals Investigation
-----------------	------------------------

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	04.04.07
--------------------	------	--------------	----------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Note of telecom with interested party concerning the investigation. Did not leave any details but was interested in why we were carrying this out and what it would be used for. I explained the nature of the work to be used for evidence gathering to determine the need for a Minerals DPD. As part of this I explained the relevance of MPS1 and the requirement to identify known minerals resources, the need to avoid sterilisation and satisfy apportionment levels through allocation of sites etc. I asked the nature of his interest and he stated that he owned land that had boreholes provided pre-war on coal reserves.

KP
 04.04.07

ACTIONS:

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Minerals Investigation – Telecom with Mark Barratt of Silkstone Environmental
-----------------	---

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	27.6.07
--------------------	------	--------------	---------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Telephone call from Mark Barratt of Silkstone Environmental Ltd who act on behalf of Marshalls Plc and Peel Holdings for Fletcher Bank and Astley Moss.

This work has been passed onto him via Marshalls.

He will respond via letter with some plans attached by 14th July at the latest (if possible, before).

He suggested there may be scope for recycling plant at Fletcher Bank and further extension to Astley Moss. He will consider any future for other reprocessing or depots/wharfs which his clients may be considering.

ACTIONS:

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Nick Horsley WBB Minerals

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	3.7.07
--------------------	------	--------------	--------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Follow up call to Nick re. his letter. He confirmed that WBB have no interest in GM area (primary extraction, secondary reprocessing, depots and wharfs) – WBB concentrated in Shires.

ACTIONS:

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Carter Jonas – Paul Clarke
-----------------	----------------------------

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	27.6.07
--------------------	------	--------------	---------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Paul Clarke called to say that some of his clients are interested in minerals investigation and can he have longer time to submit info (next week at latest).

These sites include southern extension to Pilsworth south which is in the process of being drilled and other historic sites nearby.

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Follow up Telephone Call to Chris Dobbs - tarmac
-----------------	---

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	21 Jun 2007
--------------------	------	--------------	-------------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Telephone conversation between Krista Patrick GMGU and Chris Dobbs Tarmac

Not really found interest in Minerals extraction.

Pilsworth – piggybacking on Viridor landfill operations.
 Remaining districts – Tarmac haven't looked at any other sites and not actively looking at anything for the future.
 Able to provide list of facilities within Tarmac ownership.

KP to confirm GM position on minerals, DPD, apportionment, as a first step?
 From that may be worth sitting down to a meeting with Tarmac.

Contact: Leon Cook – public affairs

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Follow up Telephone Call to Duncan Wardrop, Lafarge Aggregates
-----------------	---

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	13 July 2007
--------------------	------	--------------	--------------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Telephone conversation between John Martin GMGU and Duncan Wardrop
Lafarge Aggregates

Shopping List

Primary Extraction

- Info on sites, any evidence, future plans

Lafarge are not a land based player in GM mainly because there are not a lot of good quality aggregates in the area.

Supply minerals from outside GM through railhead.

Lafarge used desk study to search for potential extraction opportunities in GM, the results were not very optimistic for hard rock and sand and gravel.

Since railhead usage commenced, Lafarge have looked at couple of existing operations along East Lancs Road (A580) all mineral fairly poor quality.

Limestone from north Wales is brought in by lorry on occasion to Ashbury but generally straight customer.

Secondary/Reprocessing Facilities

- Where is site? **Ashbury**
- What does it produce? **Readymix concrete asphalt coating**
- What minerals are imported for this process? **Carboniferous limestone from Peak District**
- Where do they come from/roughly what quantities are brought in/How are they transported in? **half million tonnes a year or something north of this.**

- Where are the products going? (if known) **GM in general, do not travel a huge distance.**
- How is product transported out of plant? **lorries**
- What are the products used for? **Construction industry in general**

Depots/Wharfs

- Where are they? **Ashbury main depot, another railhead that is undeveloped in Northendon**
- What mode of transport in/out? **Railhead**
- What minerals are handled? **Carboniferous limestone**
- Where does input material come from? **Peak district**
- Where does it go? **Greater Manchester**
- Throughput? **Insignificant at moment, yet to become operational**

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Follow up Telephone Call to Tom Brown - Hansons
-----------------	--

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	6 July 2007
--------------------	------	--------------	-------------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Meeting arranged to take place at 2pm on 19 July between Tom Brown, KP, PH and JM

Hanson have 1 site - Montcliffe Quarry, Bolton - Gritstone

Asphalt plant in Ashton-In-Makerfield (Edge Green Lane), which also handles road planings/aggregates recycling, brings in aggregates from N Wales, Yorkshire and the Shetlands.

There is a railhead but most aggregates transported in by road

Concrete Plants:

2 in Bolton
 2 in Stockport
 2 in Salford
 2 in Central Manchester
 1 in Oldham
 1 in Wigan

Border? Chelford – Mere Farm – sand extraction

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Follow up Telephone Call to
-----------------	-----------------------------

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	13 July 2007
--------------------	------	--------------	--------------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	-------------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Telephone conversation between John Martin GMGU and Keith Frost Cemex
Left message on answerphone

Primary Extraction

- Info on sites, any evidence, future plans

Secondary/Reprocessing Facilities

(Coating Plants: Aggregate Industries, Cemex, Hanson, Lafarge, Tarmac)
 Concrete mix sites???

- Where is site?
- What does it produce?
- What minerals are imported for this process?
- Where do they come from/roughly what quantities are brought in/How are they transported in?
- Where are the products going? (if known)
- How is product transported out of plant?
- What are the products used for?

Depots/Wharfs

- Where are they?
- What mode of transport in/out?
- What minerals are handled?

FILE NOTE

SUBJECT:	Follow up Telephone Call to The Mineral Planning Group (Martin Milmore)
-----------------	---

JOB NUMBER:	5613	DATE:	29 June 2007
--------------------	------	--------------	--------------

Site Visit		Phone Call	x	Meeting		Other (Please State)	
-------------------	--	-------------------	---	----------------	--	---------------------------------	--

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Confidential There is likely to be an application to extend Pilkington Quarry to the south – a wedge of this is outside of the AoS

Hanging Chadder? Permission expired but considers there is still a sand resource.

Open cast coal applications – borehole logs will provide evidence of drift details

Manchester ship Can – excavation material used as 'amenity bund' of sandstone/sand possible resource

ACTIONS:

Email letter to Martin