



Comhairle Ceantair  
**Lár Uladh**  
**Mid Ulster**  
District Council

## Local Development Plan 2030 Draft Plan Strategy

The table below identifies the Draft Plan Strategy Reference Numbers that are referred to in the attached submission, and provides the corresponding Counter Representation Reference Number related to each.

<b>Draft Plan Strategy Representation Reference Number referred to within attached submission</b>	<b>Your Counter Representation Reference Number</b>
MUDPS/22	DPSCR-157
MUDPS/29	DPSCR-158
MUDPS/31	DPSCR-159
MUDPS/56	DPSCR-160
MUDPS/59	DPSCR-161
MUDPS/70	DPSCR-162
MUDPS/71	DPSCR-163
MUDPS/73	DPSCR-164
MUDPS/81	DPSCR-165
MUDPS/88	DPSCR-166
MUDPS/89	DPSCR-167
MUDPS/101	DPSCR-168
MUDPS/102	DPSCR-169
MUDPS/103	DPSCR-170
MUDPS/104	DPSCR-171
MUDPS/105	DPSCR-172

MUDPS/107	DPSCR-173
MUDPS/108	DPSCR-174
MUDPS/109	DPSCR-175
MUDPS/110	DPSCR-176
MUDPS/111	DPSCR-177
MUDPS/112	DPSCR-178
MUDPS/115	DPSCR-179
MUDPS/120	DPSCR-180
MUDPS/121	DPSCR-181
MUDPS/122	DPSCR-182
MUDPS/123	DPSCR-183
MUDPS/131	DPSCR-184
MUDPS/134	DPSCR-185
MUDPS/141	DPSCR-186
MUDPS/144	DPSCR-187
MUDPS/159	DPSCR-188
MUDPS/162	DPSCR-189
MUDPS/163	DPSCR-190
MUDPS/167	DPSCR-191
MUDPS/168	DPSCR-192
MUDPS/174	DPSCR-193
MUDPS/178	DPSCR-194
MUDPS/180	DPSCR-195
MUDPS/181	DPSCR-196
MUDPS/182	DPSCR-197
MUDPS/191	DPSCR-198

MUDPS/194	DPSCR-199
MUDPS/195	DPSCR-200
MUDPS/196	DPSCR-201
MUDPS/197	DPSCR-202
MUDPS/198	DPSCR-203
MUDPS/199	DPSCR-204
MUDPS/200	DPSCR-205
MUDPS/201	DPSCR-206
MUDPS/202	DPSCR-207
MUDPS/204	DPSCR-208
MUDPS/106	DPSCR-213
MUDPS/114	DPSCR-214

## JohnPaul Devlin

---

**From:** Michael Gordon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 August 2019 14:39  
**To:** DevelopmentPlan@midulstercouncil.org  
**Cc:** Emma Walker  
**Subject:** Counter-Representation to dPS Representations  
**Attachments:** dPS Counter Rep Form Dalradian.pdf; MUDC dPS Counter Representation.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam

On behalf of our client, Dalradian Gold Ltd, please find enclosed counter representations to responses received in response to the Council's consultation on the draft Plan Strategy.

We would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt by return of email.

Kind regards

Michael

**Michael Gordon**  
Director, Head of Planning Northern Ireland

**Turley**

Hamilton House  
3 Joy Street  
Belfast BT2 8LE

[turley.co.uk](http://turley.co.uk)

[Twitter](#)

[Linkedin](#)

Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily

This e-mail is intended for the above named only is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it. Turley bank account details will not change during the course of an instruction and we will never change our bank account details via email. If you are in any doubt, please do not send funds to us electronically without speaking to a member of our team first to verify our account details. We will not accept liability for any payments into an incorrect bank account. Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD. Terms and Conditions

**Mid Ulster District Council Local Development Plan 2030 - Draft Plan Strategy  
Submission of a Counter Representation**



Comhairle Ceantair  
**Lár Uladh**  
**Mid Ulster**  
District Council

**Local Development Plan  
Counter Representation Form  
Draft Plan Strategy**

Ref:
Date Received:
(For official use only)

Name of the Development Plan Document (DPD) to which this Counter representation relates

Draft Plan Strategy
---------------------

**Counter Representations must be submitted by 5pm on Friday 9 August 2019 to:**

Development Plan Team  
Planning Department  
Mid Ulster District Council  
50 Ballyronan Road  
Magherafelt  
BT45 6EN

Or by email to [developmentplan@midulstercouncil.org](mailto:developmentplan@midulstercouncil.org)

Please complete separate form for each counter representation.

**SECTION A**

**1. Personal Details**

Title

First Name

Last Name

Job Title (where relevant)

Organisation (where relevant)

**2. Agent Details (if applicable)**

Address Line 1

3 Killybrack Road

Hamilton House

Line 2

Killybrack Business  
Park

3 Joy Street

Line 3

Omagh

Belfast

Line 4

Post Code

BT79 7DG

BT2 8LE

Telephone  
Number

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

E-mail Address

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**SECTION B**

3(a). Have you submitted a representation to the Council regarding this development plan document?

Yes

No

3(b). If yes, please provide Reference No. and summary of issue raised in you representation.

Representation Ref. MUDPS83

Please see enclosed Counter Representations for details

**Counter Representation**

Any person may make a counter representation in relation to a representation seeking a change to a DPD. The purpose of a counter representation is to provide an opportunity to respond to proposed changes to the DPD a result of representations submitted under Regulation 15 and 16 of the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015.

**A counter representation must not propose any further changes to a DPD.**

4. Please provide the reference number of the representation to which your counter representation relates to.

Please see enclosed Counter Representation

5. Please give reasons for your counter representation having particular regard to the soundness test identified in the above representation.

Please note your counter representation should be submitted in full and cover succinctly all the information, evidence, and any supporting information necessary to support/justify your submission. **There will not be a subsequent opportunity to make any further submissions based on your original counter representation.** After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the independent examiner, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies at independent examination.

See enclosed Counter Representation to representation ref: MUDPS22; MUDPS29;  
MUDPS31; MUDPS56; MUDPS59; MUDPS70; MUDPS71; MUDPS73;  
MUDPS81; MUDPS88; MUDPS89; MUDPS 101; MUDPS102; MUDPS103;  
MUDPS104; MUDPS105; MUDPS107; MUDPS108; MUDPS109; MUDPS110;  
MUDPS111; MUDPS112; MUDPS115; MUDPS120; MUDPS121; MUDPS122;  
MUDPS123; MUDPS131; MUDPS134; MUDPS141; MUDPS144; MUDPS159;  
MUDPS162; MUDPS163; MUDPS167; MUDPS168; MUDPS174; MUDPS178;  
MUDPS180; MUDPS181; MUDPS182; MUDPS191; MUDPS194-202 &  
MUDPS204.

*(If not submitting via online form and additional space is required, please continue on a separate sheet)*

Signature



Date

7/3/19





# Mid Ulster District Council - Draft Plan Strategy

## Counter-representation

August 2019

1. Introduction
  1. This counter-representation is submitted on behalf of Dalradian Gold Ltd in response to representations received in response to the Council's consultation on the draft Plan Strategy (dPS) in 2019.
  2. These counter representations relate to representations made under Regulation 15 and 16 of the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 ('the Regulations'). Under Regulation 17, the Council has made available copies of all representations received in response to consultation on the draft Plan Strategy. These counter representations are submitted under Regulation 18 as they relate to site specific representations. For the avoidance of doubt 'site specific representations' mean:
    - Representations to policies relating to any proposed designations which identify a particular area (site);
    - Representations to policies which could be applied to a site that could be subject to a planning application; and
    - Representations containing references or inferences to gold mining or related proposals for a site within the Council or adjacent area.
  3. These counter-representations should be read alongside Dalradian representation reference MUDPS83.
2. Counter-representations
4. This section outlines our counter-representations to comments received by MUDC in response to consultation on the dPS.

Representation Ref.	Comment	Counter-representation
MUDPS22 – Monaghan County Council	<p><b>Comments on Sensitive Landscapes</b> The introduction of a Special Countryside Area, an Area of Constraint on Wind Turbines and High Structures and an Area of Minerals Constraint, wherein development will be restricted subject to meeting limited criteria is welcomed.</p> <p><b>Comments on SA/SEA Environmental Report</b> Concur with the overall findings of the Transboundary Screening exercise and considers that the emerging Plan will not conflict with the Monaghan County Council Development Plan (2019-2025) in relation to cross border issues of mutual interest.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD, SCA and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 and SCA1 as they fail against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 and Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
MUDPS29 – MPANI	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN 1</b> Welcomes the introduction of Mineral Reserve Policy Areas, however the Council fails to safeguard any sand and gravel deposits despite acknowledging its economic importance.</p>	<p>Dalradian considers that the Sustainability Assessment provided in support of the dPS is fundamentally flawed and the therefore the plan fails against soundness test P3. The reasons are elaborated further in Appendix 2 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p>Dalradian notes the support from MPANI, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the dPS as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not</p>

		<p>relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS31 – Department for Economy</b></p>	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN 1</b> Welcome the proposed designation of mineral reserve policy areas which are in line with advice from GSNi.</p>	<p>Dalradian notes the support from DfE, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the dPS as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS56 – Armagh, Banbridge &amp; Craigavon Borough Council</b></p>	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN1</b> Council supports the approach taken with Mineral Reserve Policy Areas, to protect workable mineral resources from being sterilised by other surface development. This will contribute towards a sustainable approach to mineral development in line with the SPSS that supports the local and regional supply chain and overall economic growth.</p>	<p>Dalradian notes the support from ABC, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the dPS as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN2</b> It is noted that a constraint on new development would be imposed along the lough shore area in the Draft Lough Neagh / Lough Beg Special Countryside Area Designation, including on mineral extraction. The protection that this gives to the lough area is acknowledged. This will be taken into account as we move towards formulating an approach to this shared environmental asset at dPS stage.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy TOU4</b> Council notes the policy for other tourism facilities/amenities and attractions. It is considered that the policy may be strengthened by including reference to proposals for tourist amenities which may be of regional importance and proposals to extend existing tourism facilities/amenities within the countryside. In relation to the provision of outdoor tourism facilities, Council would welcome further clarification around outdoor tourism proposals within an SCA. It is also unclear if due consideration has been given to the impacts that tailored approach of this policy may have on tourism growth within neighbouring councils.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to draft Policy TOU4 as it fails against soundness test CE2 and CE3. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 6, paragraph 6.16 to 6.17 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy SCA1</b> Council notes that in order to protect and enhance the natural environment in terms of landscape and visual amenity a SCA has been proposed. It is also noted that the proposed SCA does not extend to include the body of water and island within. It is noted that there are a number of breaks within the designation to facilitate Tourism Opportunity Zones and landing points for sand extraction.  The methodology for the review of the Landscape Character Areas and subsequent audit of the assessment is noted and we advise that we are currently undertaking a review of LCA's</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>

<p>which will help inform our approach.</p> <p>It is also noted that there are no Areas of High Scenic Value carried forward from the extant Local Area Plans.</p>	
<p><b>MUDPS59 – RSPB</b></p> <p><b>Comment on Draft Policy MIN2</b></p> <p>Area of blanket bog in the area of Patrick’s Lough should be identified as an ACMD.</p> <p>Special areas of constraint against the extraction of peat should be designated by Ballynahoe and Curran Bog.</p> <p>Additional area of ACMD proposed.</p> <p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN3</b></p> <p>Supporting text in Paragraph 14.22 should be revised to include reference to environmental impacts as well as human health and safety.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representations MUDPS83</p> <p>The dps proposes that all proposals for mineral extraction, whether an exception or relating to valuable minerals will still be subject to the provisions of draft Policy MIN2 and therefore it is not necessary to duplicate this policy criteria within draft Policy MIN3. Dalradian does also object to draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p>Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy SCA1</b></p> <p>Patrick’s Lough should be identified as an SCA.</p> <p>The SCA proposed for the north of Fivemiletown should be extended to reflect up to date information on hen harriers.</p> <p>Ballynahoe and Curran Bog should be identified as an SCA.</p> <p>The SCA to the north of the A6 should be extended to run to the boundary of the new A6 and to include all the lands within the whooper swan complex at Toome and Gortgill. Whooper swan areas at Newferry and within the Bann Valley should also be identified as an SCA.</p> <p>The Ramsar zoning to the south west corner of Lough Neagh should be an SCA.</p>	
<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy NH6</b></p> <p>The policy should refer to a full range of considerations and not just the ‘distinctive special character and landscape quality’. This is a more restrictive interpretation of the SPPS.</p> <p>The policy fails to include the second part of the policy requirement as articulated in paragraph 6.187 of the SPPS.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to draft Policy NH6 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8. 6 to 8.11 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS70</b></p> <p>Welcomes the introduction of SCAs within the district to preserve the qualities and characteristics of vulnerable and distinctive landscapes.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS71 - Love Screen Stop Mining</b></p> <p>The Plan has ignored critical issues of public safety in relation to toxicity problems in the extraction and processing of high value minerals. The MUDC has not based the policy on extraction and processing of high value minerals on any meaningful evidential basis.</p> <p>Strongly suggest that Policy MIN3 includes the prohibition of exploration, extraction and processing of high value minerals and hydrocarbons until a full examination of potential harms is carried out and that this examination accords with the MUDC positive duties under the ECHR and Human Rights Act 1998.</p> <p>The Plan recognises the potential for risk to human health but does not categorise the risks involved. It ignores key words which would alert residents of the council area to the nature of</p>	<p>Dalradian opposes the proposal in Representation MUDPS71 to prohibit the exploration and extraction of valuable minerals. This approach is contrary to the provisions of the SPPS (paragraph 6.157) and would therefore fail soundness test C3.</p> <p>Dalradian also opposes the proposal to identify toxins that would not be permitted under draft Policy MIN3 as there has been no evidence provided to support the assertion that the use of such chemicals would have a significant adverse impact on the environment. As such it would fail soundness test CE2. Such an approach would also be contrary to the SPPS (paragraph 6.157) and would therefore fail soundness test C3.</p> <p>Assessment of the impact of proposals for the extraction and processing of high value minerals should be undertaken through the development management process when</p>

	<p>the potential risks.</p> <p>The Plan should reference the following toxins: cyanide &amp; thio-cyanates, arsenic, lead, cadmium, zinc, silicones, radon and nano-particle toxins.</p> <p>An independent risk assessment of the extraction and processing of high value minerals should be initiated using global experts.</p>	<p>full, robust assessments can be carried out.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS73 – Shores of Traad Community Group</b></p>	<p>Welcome the introduction of SCAs and ACWTHS.</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the ACWTHS and the specifics of draft policy SCA1 and TOHS1 as they fail against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE3.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 and Section 9 paragraph 9.1 to 9.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS 81 – Secretary of Shores of Traad Community Group</b></p>	<p>See MUDPS73.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS73</p>
<p><b>MUDPS88 - Shores of Traad Community Group</b></p>	<p>See MUDPS73.</p>	<p>See Response to MUDPS73.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS89 – Fermanagh &amp; Omagh District Council</b></p>	<p><b>Comments on SCAs</b> Part of Slieve Beagh falls within the FODC area and whilst we do not propose an SCA for that part of Slieve Beagh, the ACMD designation proposed for that area in our Draft Plan Strategy would apply.</p> <p><b>Comments on Beaghmore ASAI</b> The Council welcomes the policy relation to the Beaghmore Stone Circles as they are impact shared environmental assets.</p> <p><b>Comments on Minerals Development</b> Support the introduction of ACMDs into parts of the District to protect areas such as Beaghmore and the High Sperrins which are of intrinsic landscape amenity, scientific and heritage value. We note Policy MIN 3 Valuable Minerals and Hydrocarbons which appear to take a slightly stricter approach to the exploration and extraction of valuable minerals than is currently set out the SPPs. Those areas identified under Policy MIN1 as MRPA are largely based on the designations contained with the Cookstown and Dungannon Area Plans.</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p><b>Dalradian objects to draft Policy HE1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2 and CE3.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 7 paragraph 7.1 to 7.9 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p><b>Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p><b>Dalradian objects to draft Policy MIN3 as it fails against soundness tests CE2 and C3.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 5 paragraph 5.46 to 5.60 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p>Dalradian notes the support from FODC, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the dPS as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
	<p><b>Comments of Tourism Development</b> We are supportive of the tourism strategy which is in line with regional policy as it seeks to</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to draft Policies TOU1, TOU3 and TOU4 as they fail against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE3.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 6 of</p>

<p>attain sustainable tourism development through a balance between meeting the needs of the tourist coupled with the need to conserve tourism assets and the environment.</p>	<p>Comments on Draft Policy MIN1 The plan should identify those areas most suitable for development within the plan area as set out in Appendix 1 of MUDPS101. The Council has failed to fully assess and take account of comments received in response to the Preferred Options Paper on the identification of MRPA's. The proposed MRPA's are questionable as operations are ceased. No consideration has been provided within the plan or within the assessment of alternatives in the SA/SEA as to how the council will protect economic mineral resources not protected by the MRPA from surface development.</p>	<p>Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p>MUDPS101 – Quarryplan (on behalf of a consortium of clients).</p>	<p>Dalradian notes the areas proposed by Quarryplan, however the designation of areas suitable for mineral development should be based on a robust assessment of the entire district resources and not solely limited to those put forward by Quarryplan if evidence demonstrates that other areas are suitable for development of mineral operations. It would be unreasonable to only identify those areas proposed by Quarryplan. Instead, the Council should undertake a detailed assessment of mineral reserves across the district to inform the designation of MRPA's. Furthermore, in accordance with the SPSS (para 6.155), the Council should 'safeguard mineral resources which are of economic or conservation value...' To identify MRPA without a robust assessment of reserved would render the policy approach unsound as it would fail against soundness test CE2. To only identify those locations put forward in representation MUDPS101 would also fail against soundness test P3 as the Council would fail to have assessed all reasonable alternatives.</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to draft Policy MIN5 as it fails against soundness test C3 and CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.61 to 5.65 of Representation MUDPS83. See Response to MUDPS114.</p>
<p>MUDPS102 – Quarryplan (on behalf of McGarrity Brothers Ltd)</p>	<p>See MUDPS114.</p>	<p>See Response to MUDPS114.</p>
<p>MUDPS103 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Acheson &amp; Glover)</p>	<p>See MUDPS114.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS114.</p>
<p>MUDPS104 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Stanley Bell &amp; Sons)</p>	<p>See MUDPS114.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS114.</p>
<p>MUDPS105 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Tobermore Concrete Ltd)</p>	<p>See MUDPS114.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS114.</p>
<p>MUDPS106 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Creagh Concrete)</p>	<p>See MUDPS114.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS114.</p>

MUDPS107 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Northstone (NI) Ltd)	See MUDPS114 & MUDPS113.	See response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS108 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Norman Emerson Group)	See MUDPS114 & MUDPS113.	See response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS109 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Campbell Contracts Ltd)	See MUDPS114.	See Response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS110 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Breedon)	See MUDPS114.	See response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS111 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Hollow Park Sand and Gravel)	See MUDPS114.	See response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS112 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Private Individual)	See MUDPS114.	See response to MUDPS114.
MUDPS114 – Quarryplan (on behalf of Core Aggregates)	Comments on Draft Policy MIN5 The policy appears to take a balanced approach and reflects the approach within regional policy.	Dalradian objects to draft Policy MIN5 as it fails against soundness test C3 and CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.61 to 5.65 of Representation MUDPS83.
MUDPS115 – Department for Infrastructure	Comments on Draft Policy SCA1 The draft plan strategy should clarify a policy approach towards subject areas throughout the plan area. The Lough Neagh SCA introduces a tight constraint on all development including mineral extraction, but does not refer to the High Sperrins SCA in the same way. Clarity on the application minerals policy within the High Sperrins would be welcomed.	Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.
	Comments on Draft Policy MIN1 The identification of MRPA is welcomed and reflective of the SPPS.	Dalradian notes the support from DfI, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the dPS

as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1.** The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Comments on Draft Policy MIN2**  
 Draft Policy MIN2 is general and could apply to other types of mineral development. This presentation is ambiguous. In particular the approach of setting out policy for ACMDs before the criteria for assessment minerals development is an unusual emphasis. The SPPS allows for exceptions within ACMDs, however the Council do not reference scale and time limitations within the policy. The exceptions included in the supporting text should be included within the policy wording.

The policy also sets out considerations and criteria for 'elsewhere' or land not in an ACMD, however the use of language in the policy creates uncertainty on the application of the policy. Policy MIN2 is the only Minerals policy to cross-refer to Policy GP1. Need to ensure consistency across all policies in the Plan Strategy.

The policy and justification text do not elaborate on what constitutes 'processing' for the purposes of this policy. The SPPS makes no provide for the processing of hard rocks or aggregates at existing quarries and this could significantly increase the operations of existing quarries which may not be a sustainable form of development.

**Comments on Draft Policy MIN3**

Policy does reflect the SPPS but would benefit from clearer distinction and separation in relation to valuable minerals and hydrocarbons and unconventional extraction of hydrocarbons. Minerals development in relation to valuable minerals is accepted subject to conditions. Unconventional extraction or chemical extraction of precious metals in contrary to the plan.

**Dalradian objects to draft Policy MIN3 as it fails against soundness tests CE2 and C3.** The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 5 paragraph 5.46 to 5.60 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Comments on Draft Policy MIN5**

Draft Policy MIN5 wording is vague and confusing.

**Dalradian objects to draft Policy MIN5 as it fails against soundness tests C3 and CE2.** The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 5 paragraph 5.61 to 5.65 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Comments on Draft Policy TOU3**

Policy TOU3 appears to give DRCs the same standing at defined settlements. Policy wording also requires further clarification.

**Dalradian objects to draft Policy TOU3 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE3.** The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 6 paragraph 6.13 to 6.15 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Comments on Draft Policy TOU4**

Appears to overlap with open space and outdoor recreational policies. The policy outlines that proposals for tourism facilities, amenities and attractions will be considered with regard to the impact of its scale, design and siting upon the amenity of the area or its landscape character and that buildings will be permitted where justified. No clarity is provided on the circumstances under which a new building would be justified. The use of word significant adverse impacts is also vague and could be open to misinterpretation.

**Dalradian objects to draft Policy TOU4 as it fails against soundness tests CE2 and CE3.** The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 6 paragraph 6.16 to 6.17 of Representation MUDPS83.

**Comments on Historic Environment**

**Dalradian objects to draft Policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 as they fail against soundness test**

<p>The DfI welcomes the Council's attempt to tailor policies to individual ASSIs and Beaghmore Stone Circle, Cregganadevesky and Tullahogue as per draft policies HE1, HE2, and HE3. Strategic policy set out in paragraph 6.8 of the SPPS related to the 'site and the integrity of their settings', however the draft policies do not clearly articulate both these elements. Policy should highlight the statutory protection afforded to ASAls and that the list of harmful development is not exhaustive. Cumulative impact should also be a policy consideration.</p>	<p><b>CE2 and CE3.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 7 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy SCA1</b></p> <p>The exceptional criteria list within the draft policy undermined the intent of the SCA to protect exceptional landscape as it widens the scope for development and furthermore no evidence to support open development and in-situ replacement buildings as an exception in provided by the council.</p> <p>SCA1 notes that the presumption against all development applies to Lough Neagh/Lough Beg, Slieve Beagh and High Sperrins, however Policy MIN2 of the dPS only makes reference to a tight constraint within Lough Neagh SCA. This is inconsistent.</p> <p>The council should be able to demonstrate that this policy is sustainable when considered in combination with other countryside policies and growth policies within the dPS.</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA and the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness tests CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>Comments on AONB</b></p> <p>Supporting justification text at paragraph 18.31 should be included within the draft Policy NH6 text.</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to draft Policy NH6 as it fails against soundness test CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.6 to 8.11 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS120 – Friends of the Earth</b></p> <p><b>General Comments on Minerals</b></p> <p>The Council highlights the reliance of the local economy on minerals. Given that the minerals industry is one of the most environmentally damaging industries globally, there is an imperative to find more sustainable alternatives urgently. This necessity is not reflected in the dPS, instead the plan ties the District to further dependence and thus further environmental devastation.</p> <p>The Council has not assessed the precise social and environmental impacts of extraction activities.</p> <p>The assertion that the MUDC should sacrifice its environmental integrity to satisfy external markets is extremely flawed.</p> <p>In response to the assertion that the Council's Minerals Policy helps support the delivery of the economic aspects of the Community Plan, we would assert that the Minerals Policy directly undermines the many stated outcomes of the Community Plan (see below).</p> <p><i>Outcome – We have more people working in a diverse economy</i></p> <p>The extractive industry is preventing the development of alternative, more sustainable business.</p> <p><i>Outcome – We will increasingly value our environment and enhance it for our children &amp; We give our children and young people the best chance in life.</i></p> <p>The expansion of the extractive industry blatantly contradicts these sought after outcomes. Our climate is in chaos due to our industrial activities and we are destroying the life-support systems that our children and the generations to come need to rely upon. The LDP should</p>	<p>Dalradian disagrees with the assertion that minerals development will undermine the outcomes of the Community Plan.</p> <p>In considering the identified outcomes our response is set out below:</p> <p><i>We have more people working in a diverse economy</i></p> <p>The minerals sector in Mid Ulster contributes c£10.2million to the economy each year and provides employment for 1,257 people in the district. The contribution that the minerals sector makes to the economy also goes beyond the local area and serves construction and manufacturing sectors across Northern Ireland. The minerals sector also makes a significant contribution towards providing jobs and skills across a range of spectrums, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental monitoring and management</li> <li>• Health and safety officers</li> <li>• Finance and human resources</li> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Managers, electricians, builders and plumbers</li> <li>• Construction Workers</li> <li>• Engineers, surveyors and geologists</li> <li>• Miners and Drillers; and</li> <li>• Drivers and machine operators.</li> </ul> <p>The mineral sector is a significant employer in the district and policies which will constrain the future of such a significant employer could be detrimental to the local</p>



<p>contain a strategy on how to reverse our impact on climate change.</p> <p><i>Outcome – We are better able to live longer, healthier and more active lives</i></p> <p>Extractive projects and industrial agriculture directly affect people’s health and their right to clean air, water and a healthy environment. The LDP fails to address the importance of healthy ecosystems and access to nature as being vital to wellbeing.</p> <p><i>Outcome – We care more for those most vulnerable and in need</i></p> <p>The most vulnerable are those at risk from an ailing environment, especially our children whose future we are adversely affecting by continuing to rely on the extractive industries.</p> <p><i>Outcome – We are a safe community</i></p> <p>Permitting mining and other destructive projects without a clear social licence will only cause conflict and division within and between communities and will erode trust between citizens and government. Living beside a toxic mine or unlawful quarry also does not equate to a safe community.</p>	<p>economy.</p> <p><i>We give our children and young people the best chance in life; and We are better able to live longer, healthier and more active lives</i></p> <p>Poor economic circumstances are one of the primary influencers of health and wellbeing inequalities. Communities with high levels of socio-economic deprivation are more likely to suffer from morbidity, injury, mental anxiety, depression and higher rates of premature deaths compared to less deprived communities .</p> <p>Improving economic prosperity within a community through education and employment opportunities can significantly improve long term health. Therefore, projects with the potential to offer long-term, stable employment prospects at the local level with opportunities for promotion and advancement through training and experience are therefore regarded as contributing to improved health and wellbeing.</p> <p><i>We will increasingly value our environment and enhance it for our children; We care more for those most vulnerable and in need; We are a safe community</i></p> <p>Statistics show that the mineral and quarrying industry has one of the highest compliance rates for water discharges from their sites and is not identified as a source of complaint in the Noise Compliance Statistics. Furthermore, the industry is a highly regulated sector, with regulatory requirements covering all environmental aspects, including ecological habitats, water management, waste management, air quality and noise.</p>
<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN1</b></p> <p>Object to the existence of MRPs for economic purposes. The extractive industries have substantial, adverse and irreversible effects on our environment and the LDP should be focused on transitioning to a sustainable circular economy.</p> <p>The MRPs are close to Coalisland, Dungannon and Cookstown, thus preventing the sustainable evolution of these towns and health worries for populations of these towns living so close to industrial quarrying.</p> <p>The Council should consider the identification of areas of safeguarding for mineral conservation. This would be necessary with the presence of hydrocarbons for example, which should be conserved, and not exploited, if we are to avoid the worst effects of climate breakdown.</p> <p>The SEA is incorrect and inconsistent. In one instance is stated ‘None of the approaches were found to have any significant negative impacts’ yet then goes on to state ‘Both approached are likely to be negative in terms of all of the environmental indicators because they will involve a degree of quarrying which will have spin of impacts on traffic, landscape, air quality, water quality and on the landscape.’</p>	<p><b>Dairadian objects to the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 as it fails against soundness test C3 and CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p>Dairadian objects to the assertion that extractive industries have substantial adverse and irreversible effects on the environment as no evidence is provided to support this statement. Furthermore the environmental effects of proposals for extraction are considered through the development management process and in the majority of cases, under Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.</p> <p>Dairadian objects to the suggestion that the LDP should not provide for mineral extraction. The SPPS (paragraph 6.155) is clear that:</p> <p><i>“In preparing LDPs councils should bring forward appropriate policies and proposals that must reflect the policy approach of the SPPS, tailored to the specific circumstances of the plan area. In particular LDPs should:</i></p> <p><i>Ensure that sufficient local supplies of construction aggregates can be made available for use within the local, and where appropriate, the regional market area and beyond, to meet likely future development needs over the plan period;</i></p> <p><i>Safeguard mineral resources which are of economic or conservation value, and seek to ensure that workable mineral resources are not sterilised by other surface developed which would prejudice future exploitation.”</i></p> <p><b>As such the approach proposed by Representation Ref. MUDPS120 would conflict with the SPPS and would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p>
<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN2</b></p>	<p>Dairadian objects to the suggestion in MUDPS120 that there should be no exceptions</p>

Object to the exceptions to the constraint on extraction in ACMIDs. Even a minor expansion is unacceptably damaging for these areas and the provision of stone for restoration and maintenance could be sourced outside these areas in need of special protection.

The ACMID should be extended to include the entirety of the Sperrins AONB.

Objects to the statement 'Elsewhere, extraction and processing of hard rock and aggregates will conform with the Plan. Call for a moratorium on new extractive projects until:

- A cumulative assessment on the impacts of all extractive industries in your council areas is carried out.
- A review of extant consents for extractive industries is undertaken
- An objective assessment is carried out of existing unregulated and unassessed extractive industries to assess need for further extraction and current volumes of extraction and impacts
- An independent economic assessment is carried out to assess the benefits and disbenefits of extractive industries
- Annual quarry returns have been provided
- The Review of Old Mineral Permissions is carried out
- An assessment of human rights impacts of existing and proposed extraction is undertaken.

within an ACMID. The SPPS (paragraph 6.1.64) is clear that:

*"Whilst a general presumption against the granting of planning permission for the extraction and/or processing of minerals will apply in areas protected from minerals development in the LDP, planning authorities many consider whether particular proposals should be justified as exceptions to the LDP provisions. For example, an exception to mineral developments could be justified within an area of constraint where the proposed operations are limited to short term extraction and the environmental/amenity impacts are not significant."*

In exclude exceptions from the ACMID would conflict with the approach endorsed in the SPPS and would therefore fail against soundness test C3.

Dalradian objects to the extent of the proposed ACMID as it fails against soundness test C3, CE2 and CE1. Reasons are elaborated further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83. Furthermore, the approach proposed in MUDPS120 to extend the ACMID to encompass the entire Sperrins AONB is in conflict with SPPS paragraph 6.155 and would also fail against soundness test C3.

Dalradian objects to the proposal put forward in MUDPS120 that there should be a moratorium on new mineral developments. Proposals for the extraction of minerals are currently subject to prevailing policy set out in the SPPS and the relevant Planning Policy Statements and the Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland and are therefore subject to a thorough planning assessment before being determined.

A moratorium on minerals extraction in the absence of the information set out in representation MUDPS120 would have a detrimental impact on an important sector of the local and Northern Ireland economy.

#### Comments on Draft Policy MIN3

The use of the word 'significant' regarding environmental impacts and risks to human health is subjective and thus renders the policy invalid. This policy should be replaced by a presumption against the exploration and extraction of hydrocarbons and valuable minerals, including metalliferous minerals, because of the environmentally damaging methods of extraction that are not acceptable.

Strenuously objects to the statement 'where such high value metalliferous minerals are found, there will not be a presumption against their exploitation in any area'. There should be a policy presumption against the exploration and extraction of metalliferous minerals given their destructive impacts on communities, landscapes and ecosystems.

There is sufficient gold in circulation to meet the world's current industrial needs and there are alternatives such as urban mining (mining existing waste) to recover gold and other valuable minerals.

With the introduction of the plan-led system MUDC is not obliged to follow the permissive policy and have a duty to pursue their own policies.

A precautionary approach is needed to enable the regulatory and legal context 'catch up' so a robust planning framework can be established.

The policies should:

- Develop an overarching resource vision that transforms wealth into inclusive sustainable development;

Dalradian objects to the approach proposed in MUDPS120 because it would conflict with the prevailing policy provisions within the SPPS (paragraph 6.157) which sets out that there will not be a presumption against the extraction of valuable minerals in any area. The approach proposed would therefore fail against soundness test C3.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure a new mineral resource ownership strategy with the Department for the Economy and the Crown Estates is established and how these mineral rights align with other surface rights to land.</li> <li>• Strengthen coherence and coordination with other regulatory bodies such as GSNI, PHA, NIEA and transboundary agencies from the Republic of Ireland;</li> <li>• Improve enforcement by your council for existing extractive industries;</li> <li>• Access to information, public participation and access to justice as required by the Aarhus Convention is a foundation to be established before new consents are issued.</li> <li>• A comprehensive strategy on restoration, financial bonds and aftercare needs to be established.</li> <li>• Address what are the acceptable distances of different types of extractive industries in relation to housing, farming and other land uses, schools and communities.</li> <li>• International best practice should inform the Council's mineral policies.</li> </ul> <p>Call in to question the view expressed in the plan that permitted development rights are applicable for the exploration of high value metalliferous minerals and as such escapes the assessment of the potential environmental and human health impacts.</p> <p>Permitted development rights should not be granted without EIA Screening within the Sperrins as it is a 'sensitive' area. It is clear that the cumulative impacts of exploration require both a full HRA and EIA.</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS73</p>
<p>MUDPS121 – Shores of Traad Community Group</p>	<p>See MUDPS73</p>
<p>MUDPS122 – Shores of Traad Community Group</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS73</p>
<p>MUDPS123 – Shores of Traad Community Group</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS73</p>
<p>MUDPS131 – Mid &amp; East Antrim Borough Council</p>	<p>Note the proposed Special Countryside Area designation at Lough Neagh/Lough Beagh and Lower River Bann. MEA will also be taking full account of the importance of Lough Beg and Lower Bann in bringing forward the Draft Plan Strategy. The mechanisms proposed for this have been the subject of discussions with MUDC in the past and whilst the mechanism for protecting such areas may differ between council we view that the approach taken by MUDC is sound. The extent of the SCA boundary at Lough Beg should be extended to the Council boundary down the middle of the Lough to ensure a complete approach.</p>
<p>MUDPS134 – Department for</p>	<p>Welcomes Policy SCA1 and in particular that ancillary open development relating to recreation and open space uses would be accepted.</p>
<p>Department for</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8</p>

Communities	Recommend that the presumption in support of development to provide responsible and sustainable access to the enjoyment of the SCA.	paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.
MUDPS141 – Standing Our Ground Women of Sperrins	We particularly welcome the introduction of Special Countryside Areas (SCAs).  Welcome the proposed Areas of Constraint on Mineral Development.	Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.  Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.  See response to MUDPS141.
MUDPS144 – McKenna Family	See MUDPS141	
MUDPS159 – Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council	Notes the Council's approach to Minerals policy, including the MRPSs and ACMDs	Dalradian notes the support from CC&GDC, and as set out in Representation MUDPS83, Dalradian welcomes the intention to identify mineral reserve policy areas within the DPS as this recognises the significant contribution that the mineral extraction industry makes to the economy. However, Dalradian still considers that the proposed Mineral Reserve Policy Area and the content of Policy MIN1 fails against soundness test C3 and CE2 as the Council does not identify any areas where there is a known resource that does not relate to an existing extraction operation. As such, Dalradian object to the proposed policy. The reasons are elaborated further at Section 5 paragraph 5.1 and 5.15 of Representation MUDPS83. Dalradian objects to the proposed ACMD and the specifics of draft Policy MIN2 as it fails against soundness tests C3, CE2 and CE1. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 5 paragraph 5.16 to 5.45 of Representation MUDPS83.
	Notes the Council's approach to Historic Environment	Dalradian objects to draft Policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 as they fail against soundness test CE2 and CE3. The reasons are elaborated on further at Section 7 of Representation MUDPS83.
	Notes the Council's approach to Natural Environment.	Dalradian objects to draft Policy NH6 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.6 to 8.11 of Representation MUDPS83.
MUDPS162 – Protect Slieve Gallion	See MUDPS 120.	Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.  See response to MUDPS120.
MUDPS163 – Traad Shore Community Group	See MUDPS 73	See response to MUDPS73.
MUDPS167 – Natural Environment Divisions	Comments on Draft Policy SCA1 Support in principle for the proposed SCAs. Concerned that the exceptions do not refer to the impact on natural heritage, including international designations, nor the legislative obligations regarding these designations under	Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness test CE2. The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.

<p>the Birds and Habitats Directive. This is contrary to the SPPS.</p> <p>The Plan fails to take account of DEARA POP response regarding the need to create a separate Area of High Scenic Value policy area at Lough Neagh/Lough Beg.</p> <p>A building on land excluded from the SCA still has potential to negatively impact on the landscape quality of the rest of the SCA.</p> <p>A buffer should be added to the Lough Neagh/Lough Beg SCA to ensure it is not impacted by adjacent development.</p>	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy NH6</b></p> <p>Policy is weakened as some of the policy tests in PPS2 are only provided for within supporting text. This should be moved in to the main policy text.</p> <p>The policy test should also include the need for proposals to respect local architectural styles and patterns.</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to draft Policy NH6 as it fails against soundness test CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8. 6 to 8.11 of Representation MUDPS83.</p>
<p><b>MUDPS168 - Natural Environment Division</b></p> <p><b>Comments on Draft Policy SCA1</b></p> <p>Within the justification and amplification it should be clearly stated that there is a requirement for Plan Policy NH1 to be applied prior to any development approval likely to have a significant effect within a designated European site where it is overlain by a SCA zone.</p> <p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN2</b></p> <p>Policy allows development for minor expansion to existing workings or where important benefits are provide. However, SPPS sets out that there should be a general presumption against mineral development in such area. The intent of the SPPS is to protect such areas. Policy wording should set out the presumption against such development.</p> <p>Policy does not reference short term extraction or on site processing.</p>	<p><b>Comments on Draft Policy MIN3</b></p> <p>Policy sets a general presumption in favour of the exploration and extraction of valuable minerals and hydrocarbons across the plan. This is a conflict with the intent of the SPPS to protect areas from such development (ACMD).</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to the suggestion in MUDPS174 that there should be no exceptions within an ACMD.</b> The SPPS (paragraph 6.1.64) is clear that:</p> <p><i>“Whilst a general presumption against the granting of planning permission for the extraction and/or processing of minerals will apply in areas protected from minerals development in the LDP, planning authorities may consider whether particular proposals should be justified as exceptions to the LDP provisions. For example, an exception to mineral developments could be justified within an area of constraint where the proposed operations are limited to short term extraction and the environmental/amenity impacts are not significant.”</i></p> <p><b>In excluding exceptions from the ACMD would conflict with the approach endorsed in the SPPS and would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p> <p>Dalradian objects to the approach proposed in MUDPS174 because it would conflict with the prevailing policy provisions within the SPPS (paragraph 6.157) which sets out that there will not be a presumption against the extraction of valuable minerals in any area.</p> <p><b>The approach proposed would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p>
<p><b>MUDPS178 – Pat Haughey</b></p>	<p>All reference to precious metals and minerals should be removed.</p> <p>By creating designations such as ACMD and then allowing for exclusions MUDC is effectively providing a roadmap to industrialise the MUDC region.</p> <p>There has never been any precious metal and mineral processing in MUDC, which requires a chemical processing element. This is an entirely more complex process requiring full environmental, health and economic assessments. Please remove any reference to valuable minerals and mining.</p> <p>MUDCS has unilaterally adopted a precious metal and minerals strategy, and indeed the industrialisation of the Sperrins with total disregard to the local community while ignoring the</p>	<p>Dalradian objects to the suggestion in MUDPS178 that precious metals and minerals should not be considered within the Plan Strategy. <b>This approach would be contrary to the provisions of the SPPS and would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p> <p>Furthermore, Dalradian objects to the suggestion in MUDPS178 that allowing exclusions within an ACMD is a permissive policy. The SPPS (paragraph 6.1.64) is clear that:</p> <p><i>“Whilst a general presumption against the granting of planning permission for the extraction and/or processing of minerals will apply in areas protected from minerals development in the LDP, planning authorities may consider whether particular proposals should be justified as exceptions to the LDP provisions. For example, an exception to mineral developments could be justified within an area of constraint where</i></p>

<p>main focus of the SEA, European Legislation, the RDS, HRA Regulations and the SPPS. No consideration has been given to planning application reference LA10/2017/1249/F - goes on to give an objection in detail to the planning application. Appended to the representation is the representation as submitted under MUDPS 120.</p>	<p><i>the proposed operations are limited to short term extraction and the environmental/amenity impacts are not significant.</i></p> <p><b>In excluding exceptions from the ACMD would conflict with the approach endorsed in the SPPS and would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p> <p>Proposals for all mineral extraction, whether it is an exception or relates to valuable minerals will still be subject to the provisions of draft Policy MIN2 relating to all extraction proposals.</p> <p>In response to comment made relating to planning application reference LA10/2017/1249/F, all current proposals for mineral extraction will be assessed against the prevailing planning policy contained within the SPPS and Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland. They will therefore be subject to a thorough planning assessment. See also response to MUDSP120.</p>
<p>MUDPS180 -</p>	<p>See MUDPS 120</p>
<p>MUDPS181</p>	<p>See MUDPS 141</p>
<p>MUDPS182 – Concerned Broughderrig Residents Association</p>	<p>See MUDPS 141</p>
<p>MUDPS191</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS178.</p>
<p>MUDPS194 - 202</p>	<p>Template Letter</p> <p>Welcome the provision being made to protect and preserve the qualities and characteristics of vulnerable and distinctive landscapes.</p> <p>Welcomes the introduction of Special Countryside Areas.</p> <p>South Sperrins should be afforded further protection.</p>
<p>MUDPS204</p>	<p>The Plan has no vision for the AONB. The Plan Strategy has omitted this area from development (for tourism) is believed by anti-mining groups in the area, possibly due to the council's objective to allow the mining of precious metals in this area or natural beauty. Such mining requires the use of toxic substances and the development of industrial buildings, machinery, would have a detrimental impact on the environment, landscape and human health.</p> <p>Minerals policy conflicts with the development of mining and protecting important nature, conservation areas. The DPS does not guarantee the protection of this area of natural beauty which facilitating mineral development.</p> <p>Mining development of precious metals should be omitted from the area plan.</p>
<p>MUDPS178</p>	<p>See response to MUDPS178.</p>
<p>MUDPS120</p>	<p><b>Dalradian objects to the proposed SCA the specifics of draft Policy SCA1 as it fails against soundness test CE2.</b> The reasons are elaborated on further in Section 8 paragraph 8.1 to 8.5 of Representation MUDPS83.</p> <p>Dalradian objects to the approach proposed in MUDPS120 because it would conflict with the prevailing policy provisions within the SPPS (paragraph 6.157) which sets out that there will not be a presumption against the extraction of valuable minerals in any area. <b>The approach proposed would therefore fail against soundness test C3.</b></p>

7 August 2019

DALB3001