

**Donna Sprawson**

---

**From:** Bryan.Geake@kent.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 06 December 2021 11:27  
**To:** Planning Applications  
**Subject:** Planning App Ref. TM/21/02866/FL Construction of five buildings to provide six units for industrial processes etc Land East of Little Preston Yard and North of M20 Coldharbour Lane Aylesford Kent

Dear Matthew Broome

**PROPOSAL: Construction of five buildings to provide six units for industrial processes (Use Class E(g)(iii)); industrial (Use Class B2); and/or storage and distribution (Use Class B8)) purposes, with ancillary offices and associated landscaping, car parking, servicing and access arrangements  
LOCATION: Land East of Little Preston Yard and North of M20 Coldharbour Lane Aylesford Kent**

**Planning App Ref. TM/21/02866/FL**

Thank you for consulting the County Council's Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team on the above planning application.

I can confirm that the application site is not within 250 metres of a safeguarded minerals or waste management facility. Therefore, it does not have to be considered against the safeguarding exemption provisions of Policy DM 8: Safeguarding Minerals Management, Transportation, Production and Waste Management Facilities of the adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 3013-30.

With regard to land-won minerals safeguarding matters it is the case that the area of the application site is coincident with safeguarded mineral deposits in the area, that being the Hythe Formation (Ragstone) Limestone, the Sandgate Formation. Therefore, the application details should include a Minerals Assessment (MA) to determine if the safeguarded mineral deposit is being needlessly sterilised, and if not whether an exemption to mineral safeguarding pursuant to Policy DM 7: Safeguarding Mineral Resources of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 can be invoked.

The applicant has prepared a Mineral Assessment (MA), by SLR in support of the application. The MA identifies the area where the proposed development is coincident with the safeguarded minerals, it does not then investigate if the Hythe Formation (Ragstone) deposit is of a viable nature, though does report that the Sandgate Formation is very limited and of no recognisable economic importance or viability. It does assess that the area (2,59ha) and a 40% assumed hard rock to un-usable hassock ratio would yield a 280,000 tonnes resource if prior extraction were to occur to a depth of 10m. The MA then assess whether or not any of the exemption criteria of Policy DM 7 can apply.

The MA concludes that while it is unknown if the Ragstone (hard rock-limestone) is of a characteristic that would make it a valuable resource for aggregate production it concludes that the costs involved in prior extraction would render any extraction unviable. The County Council is of the view that this conclusion is reasonable, and that criterion 1 of Policy DM 7: Safeguarding Mineral Resources applies to both safeguarded mineral deposits affected by the proposal.

The County Council has therefore no minerals or waste safeguarding objections or further comments to make regarding this proposal.

Yours sincerely

*Bryan Geake BSc Hons (Geol), MSc, MRTPI*

Bryan Geake | Principal Planning Officer | Environment, Planning and Enforcement | Growth, Environment and Transport | Kent County Council First Floor, Invicta House, County Hall, Maidstone, Kent ME14 1XX | Telephone: 03000 413376 | [www.kent.gov.uk/planning](http://www.kent.gov.uk/planning)

This email has been scanned by TMBC before delivery to your mailbox. Please click [here](#) to report this email as spam and help train the filter.