

## C) SOUNDNESS

### Matter 1 – Proposed Mineral Sites

#### iii) Sand and Gravel MS-1: *Production of Sand and Gravel*

##### General Questions

74. Do the allocated sites appropriately match the demand for each type of sand and gravel, and are they as far as reasonably practicable, appropriately located geographically?

74. With regards to Tatchells Quarry, the site provides principally for sand from the Poole Formation and, being an extension to an existing site, is considered to be appropriately located.

75. Do the proposed allocations sit within the sand and gravel resource areas/blocks from which the MS indicates that new sites should be identified? Should this be made clear in the MSP?

75. With regards to Tatchells Quarry, Yes. This could be made clearer by adopting the proposals as suggested in question 76.

76. For effectiveness, should the resource blocks be superimposed on Fig 1(Sand and Gravel site allocations)?

76. Yes. This would appear to be a sensible suggestion especially given the different scales of the plans.

77. Natural England suggests that reference be made in Policy MS-1 to the range of mitigation measures required for sand and gravel sites as listed in Appendix 2 of the HRA Screening Report so as to give this mitigation the weight of policy. Should these mitigation measures be set out in MS-1 to provide more certainty that they would be met?

77. No. This is not considered necessary as the mitigation measures relevant to each site differ. The appropriate wording recommended for inclusion in Policy MS-1 covering sites AS-06, AS-12 and AS-13 has been included in the policy as currently drafted.

78. Alternatively, would it be as effective to reference these mitigation measures in the DGs as opposed to committing them to the body of Policy MS-1?

78. Yes. This would be the most appropriate place to list the potential mitigation measures relevant to the site in question.

79. As suggested by Natural England, should Policy MS-1 make reference to “*work[ing] towards achieving public benefits within the restoration vision*”

79. No. This is not considered necessary or appropriate. Each case should be considered on its merits at planning application stage.