

APPENDIX 7.8:
ALLOCATIONS TABLE 5.4 FROM RTS 2ND REVIEW

Table 5.4: Calculation of Allocations Required for Land-won Sand & Gravel Aggregates – North Wales

Local Planning Authority	Overall 'Preferred' Apportionment (S&G & CR) ¹ (mt)	Historic proportion supplied from sand & gravel sources ²	New Annualised Apportionment for sand & gravel ³ (mt)	Total Apportionment Required over 22 years	Existing permitted reserves at end of 2016 in mt ^{4, 5}	Existing landbank ⁶ (years)	Surplus or Shortfall (-) of Existing Permitted Reserves (mt)	Minimum Allocation needed to meet Required Provision ⁷ (mt)	Additional reserves at Dormant sites, 2016 ⁴ (mt)
Denbighshire	0.860	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	n/a	0.000	0.000	0
Flintshire	3.582	6.23%	0.223	4.912	1.369	6.1	-3.543	3.543	0.5
Wrexham	0.646	100.00%	0.646	14.217	12.652	19.6	-1.565	1.565	0
Conwy + Snowdonia NP	1.201	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	n/a	0.000	0.000	0
Gwynedd	1.129	15.44%	0.174	3.834	1.175	6.7	-2.659	2.659	0
Isle of Anglesey	0.321	0.00%	0.000	0.000	0.000	n/a	0.000	0.000	0
Sub-totals, North Wales	7.738	13.40%	1.044	22.963	15.196		-7.767	7.767	0.5

NOTES:

1 Taken from Tables 5.2 (North Wales) or Table 5.3 (South Wales)

2 Based on RAWP data over the 10-year baseline period (2007 – 2016)

3 Assumes that the historic proportion is maintained, with the exception of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park where a slight adjustment has been made to avoid the need for allocations.

4 Data provided by the RAWP secretary for December 2016

5 Permitted reserves exclude those at dormant sites.

6 Landbanks = stock of permitted reserves at active and inactive sites, expressed in terms of the annualised apportionment

7 Allocations required = calculated shortfall, if any.

8. The sand & gravel allocations needed for Ceredigion could potentially be provided, in part, from resources in neighbouring parts of Carmarthenshire, despite being in a different sub-region.

Where allocation requirements are shown these are the minimum amounts required to meet the RTS requirements. In many cases an application for an individual new permission will exceed these amounts, in the interests of economic viability. Such applications should not be rejected purely on the grounds of exceeding the minimum requirements shown here. In some cases, the suggested allocations may already have been partially or entirely fulfilled, either by new permissions granted since December 2016, or by allocations that have already been identified in LDPs. Further details are given in the Regional Appendices.