

Our ref: CB/ST18384/LET-REG-19

Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2024

Your ref:

Local Plan,  
Rutland County Council Offices,  
Catmose House,  
Catmos Street,  
Oakham,  
Rutland, LE15 6HP

To whom it may concern,

**Regulation 19: Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)**

**Proposed Minerals Extraction Site at New Road, Stretton**

**Introduction**

This submission has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong on behalf of ‘The Heritage Quarry Group’ in response to the Regulation 19 Consultation currently being undertaken by Rutland County Council in connection with their emerging Local Plan. This submission seeks to continue to provide a further update and clarity on the availability of a viable and deliverable minerals extraction site at land off New Road, between Stretton and Thistleton.

**Emerging Local Plan**

This submission builds on previous submissions made throughout the emerging Local Plan (eLP) development process, reaffirming the sites suitability, deliverability, and availability to contribute significantly towards identified mineral need. For the avoidance of doubt, this submission focuses solely on the eLP policies and facets pertinent to mineral extraction and provision and does not seek to provide comment on wider Local Plan matters.

Further support is given to the inclusion of **Policy MIN5: Site-specific allocations for the extraction of building stone**. This policy specifically identifies the proposed extraction site (referred to in the policy as ‘M1 New Road, Hooby Lane’), as a draft allocation to be delivered through the eLP. It is further noteworthy that the site is the sole additional allocation for the extraction of building stone within the eLP, placing significant reliance on its delivery in order to continue to meet quantified need throughout the eLP period.





We would wish to make comment on the specific nature of the allocation and restricted nature of the allocation to extraction of building stone only.

Review of the supporting policy justification correctly details the circumstances under which the existing permission at Thistleton Quarry is no longer economically viable, and that the extraction site at Hooby Lane is proposed to address any shortfall that not working the reserve at Thistleton would leave. This description and reasoning remain fully accurate and relevant, robustly justifying the inclusion of Hooby Lane as an allocation in the eLP under Policy MIN5.

This effective exchange of sites is also supported at a national level within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 126 identifies that:

*‘Planning policies and decisions need to reflect changes in the demand for land. They should be informed by regular reviews of both the land allocated for development in plans, and of land availability. Where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan:*

*a) it should, as part of plan updates, reallocate the land for a more deliverable use that can help to address identified needs’ (or, if appropriate, deallocate a site which is undeveloped)’.*

The exchange of mineral resource at Thistleton for that at Hooby Lane draws direct support from the facets of paragraph 126, as it responds positively to a local change in land availability and deliverability through the Local Plan process, addressing quantified mineral need through adjusting the adopted site allocations.

Section 17 of the NPPF (December 2023) details guidance for ‘Facilitating the Sustainable use of Minerals’. The draft allocation at Hooby Lane responds positively to all relevant facets within this section, with paragraph 215 being of particular note. This states it is ‘essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals’, and that ‘Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found’.

The proposals will help secure a deliverable supply of building stone throughout the plan period, compensating for the loss of supply at Thistleton Quarry. Further, the site is demonstrably suitable in its location, being located in a ‘Limestone Aggregate Area of Search’ (Policy MIN1) and a ‘Limestone and Clay Mineral Safeguarding Area’ (Policy MIN3).

However the restriction to Building stone only does not accurately reflect the exchange on mineral being proposed and would not enable such an exchange via a formal Unilateral Undertaking to be undertaken leaving Thistleton Reserve being a potential site that could come forward at some stage during the plan. To explain in more detail, we have set out the background to the Thistleton Reserve below.



### Relevant Planning History

A historic application for the extraction of minerals was made in 1951 by Stewarts and Lloyds Minerals Ltd which encompasses a significant area, crossing the boundaries of what is now Lincolnshire and Rutland authority areas.

The application was determined by the Minister of Housing and Local Government in two parts, with a decision being issued in 1953 and a subsequent decision issued in 1954. This was undertaken as there was a pressing need to plan for the working of minerals in the short term between the Clipsham Fault and the Gunby-Clipenham fault. The second element of the permission determined in 1954 relates to the remainder of the site which is understood to be land within the proximity of South Witham, and was not expected to be “worked for some considerable time”, as noted in the 1953 decision.

To facilitate the extraction of mineral at Thistleton a ROMP submission was undertaken through application 96/0089 submitted in 1996, and subsequently granted by the Secretary of State in November 2000. This application amended the original permission to include the extraction of limestone, and notes that all works must cease and the site be fully restored by 2042. To protect the residential amenity in the village of Thistleton output from the quarry was restricted to 15,000 tonnes of mineral per month or 80,000 tonnes per annum totalling 6.4 million tonnes over the permission period.

The extant permission for the Thistleton Quarry makes up 6.4Mt of the permitted reserves in the County and is currently inactive. The site is considered to be undeliverable on the basis the site is not economically viable due to the costs involved of developing the associated haul road and annual limit on sales.

### Potential Mineral Present

A Geological Appraisal (GA) has been undertaken in support of any potential proposals at the site which seeks to establish the presence of minerals, quantum of mineral available and economic viability of extraction.

The GA identifies that the site lies on a bedrock of Lincolnshire Limestone, the same mineral currently extracted at Hooby Lane Quarry to the south. Past borehole logs examined have revealed that the Lincolnshire Limestone present ranges from between 23m and 36m in thickness, with an average thickness of 31.2m. Based on these figures, a Mineral Resource Assessment has been undertaken, factoring in appropriate standoffs from any properties, highways and agricultural boundaries as appropriate.

To this end, HQG propose to develop a quarry on land off New Road near Stretton. The development will involve the extraction of building stone and walling stone, crushed rock



(Lincolnshire Limestone) and the processing of stone to produce a range of building stone products. The proposals entail the extraction of approximately 5.8 million saleable tonnes, and 6.7 million in-situ tonnes pre wastage and processing losses (a 15% waste factor, to account for processing losses and the possibility of karstic clays and weathering).

The principal impetus driving the effective exchange of the current site at Thistleton for an alternative site at Hooby Lane, is the ability to make a proactive contribution to mineral need, without the evident complexities and economic challenges which have and will continue to prevent the current Thistleton site from making any contribution. Due to the restriction on annual sales and the cost of securing an alternative access Thistleton will not make any contribution to identified mineral need within either the current or emerging Local Plan period, leaving a significant gap in the resources available to Rutland Council to meet identified need. Given the constraints placed on annual sales and the cost of seeking an alternative access the identified mineral resource at Thistleton is not deliverable on the basis the site is not economically viable.

The inclusion of Hooby Lane as a site for the **crushed limestone alongside extraction of building stone under Policy MIN5** and the rationale behind should therefore be supported as this enables an exchange for the Thistleton permission to occur.

It is re-emphasised that the circumstances necessitating the exchange of Thistleton for Hooby Lane remain fully applicable, and that the site at Hooby Lane remains fully suitable, available, and deliverable. There are no policy or technical considerations which would prevent the delivery of the site, or its allocation in the eLP, or the subsequent much needed mineral provision to meet identified need.

**The alteration of Policy MIN5 to enable allocation for both crushed limestone and building stone is therefore considered necessary and justified.**

Its inclusion would be fully supported by national policy, and it is therefore urged that RCC progress the eLP, and further policy assurance be provided within respect to Hooby Lane and Policy MIN5.

### Conclusions

This representation is submitted in response to the regulation 19 consultation in connection with the emerging Rutland Local Plan. Its principle purpose is to raise awareness of the availability of the availability of a potential minerals extraction site at land off New Road.

Overall it is considered that the proposed site is a suitable, sustainable and viable proposals for the principle extraction of crushed limestone and building stone. The site is available for



inclusion within the emerging Local Plan or as a windfall site able to respond to noted demand for the mineral.

We request that consideration be given to sites inclusion within the plan or delivery through alternative means and would be happy to discuss further with Rutland Council.

**Yours sincerely**

**for Wardell Armstrong LLP**

**Chris Bean**

**Technical Director**

**chris.bean@wardell-armstrong.com**