

Greater Manchester Minerals DPD

Preliminary Meeting: 11.15am 6th December 2011, Manchester Town Hall

Note of Meeting

1. The Inspector thanked those who were in attendance for coming and stated that he had called the meeting because, having read the submitted DPD, there were some issues which he wished to draw to the attention of the Joint Councils early in the Examination process, rather than waiting until the hearings begin.

Landbanks

2. The Inspector recognised that the DPD refers to the need to make provision for the sub-regional apportionment. However, it does not have any form of policy which expressly sets out the length of landbank as an indicator of when new permissions for aggregates are likely to be needed. This is at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock. The landbank periods are identified in the DPD in the Background information on minerals and Area of Search Methodology, but the Inspector considered that there needs to be a stronger policy reference to the landbanks including the actual reference to the periods which would then be consistent with MPS1.

3. The GMGU accepted that the DPD could be strengthened and would suggest an amendment, possibly to Policy 2 and possibly after discussions with the Minerals Products Association who had made representations on that issue. The change should not be a surprise to users of the DPD in that there would be no new information but, nevertheless, the Inspector considered that the publicity should be of the level required to effect a soundness change. This could take place following the hearings and be part of publicity for any other changes which there might be as a result of the Examination, minor, or otherwise.

Areas of Search

4. The Inspector raised his concerns about the scale and readability of Map 2 in the submitted DPD which shows the Areas of Search for the whole of Greater Manchester on an A3 fold out from the document. However, the GMGU stated that more detailed plans had been available throughout the plan preparation process and at the publicity venues so that land could be specifically identified if wished. The GMGU undertook to produce a note explaining how the Areas of Search were displayed during publicity at the stages prior to submission so that members of the public and any other interested persons would have known the delineation of land to which reference was made.

Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs)

5. The Inspector asked the GMGU for a note to demonstrate that the Joint Councils fully understood the implications of the definition of MSAs on a

relatively widespread scale. He was particularly interested in who would be assessing the economic viability of the mineral resource to be safeguarded in any particular case and the mechanics of safeguarding.

Timeline for any Changes

6. The Inspector asked the GMGU for a timeline of events (publicity etc) if there were to be any changes, assuming the hearings would take place on 22nd and 23rd February 2012 at Stockport Town Hall.

Other Matters

7. The Inspector tabled a draft of Matters and Issues for discussion at the Hearings and asked the GMGU for any comments about the list to be sent to him. This list is attached to the note.

8. The Inspector also stated that he considered a Pre Hearing Meeting was unnecessary and undertook to issue a Guidance Note for participants as soon as possible. He suggested at the meeting that the deadline for any other evidence for the hearings to be submitted to Chris Hudson, the Programme Officer (Tel: 01617794808) by two weeks before the hearings begin; ie, 8th February 2012.

A Mead
Inspector

14 December 2011