

# Sand and Gravel Additional Consultation Representations to NCC at 11/8/2014

## Contents

Contents.....	1
Introduction .....	2
MP2: Sand and gravel provision .....	20
MP: Sand and gravel - MP2o Coddington.....	29
Justification .....	67
Coddington.....	68
Appendix 1: Policies Map and inset maps .....	80
MP2o - Coddington .....	81

## Introduction

Representation ID: [25719](#)

COMMENT Cemex UK operations (Kirsten Hannaford-Hill)

Summary:

I would like to take this opportunity to summarise the Company's comments related to the Minerals Local Plan Consultation Preferred Approach 23 October - 4 December 2013.

Cemex is committed to the reclamation of mineral operations which is reflected in the Company's membership of the Mineral Products Association Restoration Guarantee Fund providing security and assurance to third party landowners and the Mineral Planning Authority. Sustainability and sustainable development is embedded into Cemex's business strategy and day to day operations looking at Sustainable Construction, Environment and Biodiversity and Health and Safety. The Company's operational procedures have been built upon our sustainability vision to minimise our environmental footprint and to enhance biodiversity in the long term. The Company is also in the process of developing a Climate Change strategy which will take into consideration National Planning Guidance.

[More details about Rep ID: 25719](#)

(Attached submission – not available at 11.8.14)

Representation ID: [25718](#)

COMMENT Cemex UK operations (Kirsten Hannaford-Hill)

Summary:

I would like to take this opportunity to summarise the Company's comments related to the Minerals Local Plan Consultation Preferred Approach 23 October - 4 December 2013.

Cemex has developed a Biodiversity Strategy (Biodiversity strategy 2010 - 2020) in partnership with RSPB to create a vision to ensure a positive contribution to the environment and biodiversity through enhancing existing operations, and planning to create more biodiversity opportunities in line with UK priorities.

[More details about Rep ID: 25718](#)

(Attached submission – not available at 11.8.14)

Representation ID: [25717](#)

COMMENT Cemex UK operations (Kirsten Hannaford-Hill)

Summary:

I would like to take this opportunity to summarise the Company's comments related to the Minerals Local Plan Consultation Preferred Approach 23 October - 4 December 2013.

The Company would like to endorse our sustainable development strategies which complement policies within Chapter 5 of Minerals Local Plan Consultation Preferred Approach 23 October - 4 December 2013 promotes sustainable development.

[More details about Rep ID: 25717](#)

(Attached submission – not available at 11.8.14)

Representation ID: [25716](#)

**OBJECT** Cemex UK operations (Kirsten Hannaford-Hill)

Summary:

I would like to take this opportunity to summarise the Company's comments related to the Minerals Local Plan Consultation Preferred Approach 23 October - 4 December 2013.

An additional policy is sought to safeguard existing and proposed minerals facilities providing a clear standoff of at least 250m. Clarification is sought of how the mineral consultation and safeguarding will be implemented with local district / borough councils and should specify thresholds to be implemented.

Change To Plan:

Add additional policy to safeguard existing and proposed mineral facilities (with 350m buffer)

[More details about Rep ID: 25716](#)

(Attached submission – not available at 11.8.14)

Representation ID: [24829](#)

COMMENT Natural England (Consultation Services)

Summary:

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

We note that the HRA Screening report has been carried out for the Minerals Local Plan and this should be updated to reflect the changes set out in this document.

[More details about Rep ID: 24829](#)

(Attached submission – see below)

Representation ID: [24828](#)

COMMENT Natural England (Consultation Services)

Summary:

Revised Sustainability Appraisal

We note that the Sustainability Appraisal scores the Barton in Fabis site very negatively in the operational phase and this reflects our own concerns with the impacts that may result on the Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI and the Holme Pit SSSI.

We would be grateful if you could clarify the situation regarding a number of sites which appear in the Sustainability Appraisal (eg Shelford and Bulcote Farm) which do not appear in the main document.

[More details about Rep ID: 24828](#)

(Attached submission – see below)

Representation ID: [24827](#)

COMMENT Natural England (Consultation Services)

Summary:

National Character Areas

We suggest that when considering the restoration of minerals sites in the development briefs that the National Character Areas should be considered, although we do acknowledge that Landscape Character Areas are mentioned in Policy DM5 of the main Preferred Approach Consultation document

[More details about Rep ID: 24827](#)

Attached Files for this Submission:

[Natural England Rep](#) - Supporting Document

Date: 08 July 2014

Our ref: 120785

Your ref: Minerals Local Plan

To: Steven Osborne-James, Senior Planning Officer, Nottinghamshire County Council, [development.planning@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:development.planning@nottscc.gov.uk)

BY EMAIL ONLY

Customer Services, Hornbeam House, Crewe Business Park, Electra Way, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Mr Osborne-James

Planning consultation: Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan – Additional Consultation and Sand and Gravel Provision

Thank you for your consultation on the above document which was received by Natural England on 14 May 2014. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England acknowledges that our comments made at the previous consultation have been fully considered. We are particularly pleased to note that our comments highlighting the potential links to both the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the prospective Sherwood Special Protection Area (SPA) have been incorporated into the site development briefs within this document.

We note that the key changes set out in this current consultation relate to six new or extended sites and we have the following comments on these:

**MP2m - Amended site boundary at Barnby Moor, near Retford**

We welcome the inclusion of advice on the potential indirect impact on the nearby cluster of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) (also known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation SINC) around Daneshill and the recognition of the potential indirect hydrological impacts to the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and Sherwood Forest prospective SPA.

**MP2g Amended site boundary at Langford Lowfields South (to exclude the Scheduled Ancient Monument)** No comments.

**MP2i Additional western extension at Langford Lowfields** No comments.

**MP2b Amended site boundary to Bawtry Road North**

We welcome the inclusion of advice to consider the indirect impact on the nearby cluster of Local Wildlife Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) around Newington and Misson.

Page 2 of 4

### **MP2q New site at Barton-in-Fabis, near Nottingham**

Natural England is very concerned with the impact that a new minerals site may have on this location of high ecological value. In particular both the Attenborough SSSI and Holme Pit SSSI are in close proximity to the proposed site (see our detailed comments below). In addition there is a cluster of Local Wildlife Sites which form an important ecological corridor beside the River Trent which would be directly affected by the proposed site. These Local Wildlife Sites make an important contribution to the wider ecological network which is a specific aim of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). At paragraph 109 of the NPPF it states that, “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.” Natural England therefore considers that this proposed allocation does not comply with the NPPF.

#### **Attenborough SSSI**

Natural England is very concerned that the Site Development Brief does not fully consider the potential impacts of this potential new minerals site on the Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI. We acknowledge that the brief mentions the Attenborough Nature Reserve in terms of quarry restoration and the Holme Pit SSSI but we consider that there should be specific inclusion of the potential impact on the Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI.

Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI is a nationally important site for its lowland eutrophic open waters with emergent vegetation, wet floodplain woodland, unimproved floodplain grassland, a rich assemblage of breeding birds associated with lowland open waters and their margins, and wintering shoveler (*Anas clypeata*) and bittern (*Botaurus stellaris*). Extracting sand and gravel in this area could cause water levels to drop, pollution/siltation problems and potentially non-native species issues within the SSSI. Considering the size of the proposed minerals site, the length of time for excavation and the proximity to the SSSI we would expect to see the development brief clearly consider the potential impacts that this site may cause and the need for detailed studies to confirm whether or not the site could be used for mineral extraction. Where de-watering is proposed hydrogeological reports are advised at the Plan rather than application stage under Environment Agency Groundwater guidelines.

We also note that the potential impact on the Attenborough SSSI has not been mentioned within the Revised Sustainability Appraisal and this should be rectified. We would welcome consultation on an updated Sustainability Appraisal when available.

#### **Holme Pit SSSI**

Holme Pit SSSI is notified for standing water, swamp and reedbeds and is in a vulnerable state at the moment, we would therefore be very concerned about any mineral extraction sites being in such close proximity.

One of the main issues is hydrology owing to the position of the proposed site on the floodplain. It is thought that the SSSI already receives regular flooding from the Trent, and whilst we note that the brief states that excavation would be kept away from the Trent itself, it is not clear how near to the SSSI any other excavation or associated activity would be.

In November 2013 a condition assessment recorded the SSSI as not meeting objectives for water quality and subsequent loss of desired plant species. Possible reasons for this are

currently being investigated and we may know more by the time the minerals plan is implemented. However in the meantime this site remains vulnerable to water quality and hydrology changes which result from mineral extraction.

We acknowledge that the brief gives priority to wetland sites within the proposed restoration scheme (*Page 3 of 4*) which we would support as this could enhance the setting of the SSSI and expand its valuable habitats. However we would need to be certain that all concerns about the effects on the current habitats have been considered first.

**MP2p New site at Flash Farm, Averham, Newark**

We welcome the inclusion of advice to consider the indirect impacts on Kelham Woods SINC.

**National Character Areas (NCAs)**

We suggest that when considering the restoration of minerals sites in the development briefs that the National Character Areas should be considered, although we do acknowledge that Landscape Character Areas are mentioned in Policy DM5 of the main Preferred Approach Consultation document.

NCAs divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. Their boundaries follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries, making them a good decision making framework for the natural environment. The Landscape Opportunities sections within each of these profiles may particularly provide helpful guidance for restoration proposals Nottinghamshire falls within a number of NCAs but the ones relevant for the sites within this consultation are as follows:

48: Trent & Belvoir Vales

69:Trent Valley Washlands

39:Humberhead Levels

**Revised Sustainability Appraisal**

We note that the Sustainability Appraisal scores the Barton in Fabis site very negatively in the operational phase and this reflects our own concerns with the impacts that may result on the

**Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI and the Holme Pit SSSI.**

We would be grateful if you could clarify the situation regarding a number of sites which appear in the Sustainability Appraisal (e.g. Shelford and Bulcote Farm) which do not appear in the main document.

**Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)**

We note that the HRA Screening report has been carried out for the Minerals Local Plan and this should be updated to reflect the changes set out in this document.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Roslyn Deeming on 0300 060 1524. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

Roslyn Deeming, Land Use Adviser

Roslyn Deeming

Adviser, Sustainable Development Team, East Midlands Area Ceres House 2, Searby Road  
Lincoln, LN2 4DT  
0300 060 1524

[roslyn.deeming@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:roslyn.deeming@naturalengland.org.uk)

Representation ID: [25398](#)

SUPPORT Mineral Products Association (Malcolm Ratcliff)

Summary:

We are disappointed to see that the mpa has not reconsidered the level proposed allocations given our evidence on the shortfall of sand and gravel, in Donaster to 2028. A revised calculation puts this at 500Ktpa. It is clear that the preferred market solution is such a shortfall is to source replacement resource from Nottinghamshire.

Change To Plan:

Increase sand and gravel provision to 500,000tpa to the end of the plan

[More details about Rep ID: 25398](#)

Original Submission:

We are disappointed to see that the mpa has not reconsidered the level of proposed allocations given our evidence in December 2013 on the shortfall in sand and gravel likely to be experienced by Doncaster and South Yorkshire to 2028 and beyond. A revised calculation puts this at about 500ktpa<sup>1</sup>. It is clear that the preferred market solution to such a shortfall is to source replacement resources from Nottinghamshire.

However, this is unacknowledged in the Preferred Approach 2013 and this consultation. In our view there is clear evidence that reliance on a simple 10 year rolling average of local production will be insufficient to reflect future demand for Nottinghamshire's sand and gravel and that the plan proposals need to be revised to accommodate a higher apportionment. Given this, the provision set out in this document will be insufficient. However, we have no objection to the sites put forward and support the allocations.

<sup>1</sup> Calculated as the difference between the most recent apportion

Change to Plan: Increase sand and gravel provision by 500,000tpa to the end of the plan period.

Signed M S Ratcliff Date 11th July 2014

Malcolm Ratcliff

Address: Mineral Products Association, Gillingham House, 38-44 Gillingham St, LONDON, SW1V 1HU

Representation ID: [24773](#)

**COMMENT** Homes and Communities Agency (. Enquiries .)

Summary:

No land interests within Newark and Sherwood.

[More details about Rep ID: 24773](#)

Representation ID: [24509](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

I object to the fact that the website document collating the 2013 Consultation comments and giving the NCC responses to them only lists each comment as a comment summary (restricted to 100 words) - although the NCC responses are in full with no word limit. It is impossible to express a detailed, complex, multi-faceted, technical argument in a 100 word tweet - serious submissions are rendered incomprehensible. In this document, each submitted comment over 100 words must have a single-click link to the full original submission. This is necessary to allow properly informed public consultation.

Change To Plan:

In future website documents collating comments and NCC responses, each comment should include:

- 1 summary
- 2 link to the full original comment if > 100 words
- 3 Suggested actions
- 4 NCC response to issues raised
- 5 NCC actions.

[More details about Rep ID: 24509](#)

Representation ID: [24414](#)

COMMENT Nottingham Friends of the Earth (Mr Nigel Lee)

Summary:

Why does the Minerals Plan still have no precautionary policy on unconventional hydrocarbons?

[More details about Rep ID: 24414](#)

Representation ID: [24370](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Martin Jordan

Summary:

This area will be ruined for a considerable period of time  
It will affect so many lives in an adverse way due to continuous noise and dust.  
I can't believe with all the money spent on flood defence a scheme is proposed that will increase risk.

It is just a crazy scheme for this area

Change To Plan:

The change should be the plan is abandoned  
The population of greater Nottingham neither want or need this development.

[More details about Rep ID: 24370](#)

Representation ID: [24362](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The consultation website main page directs the public to the Preferred Approach Consultation Document [PDF] 206 page pdf. It is not properly formatted and accessible - some text is searchable / readable by a text reader, but large sections of wording are graphics so cannot be searched or automatically read out to people with vision impairment. Searching for the text 'Coddington' gives no hits so without manual searching the information is concealed; for many search terms the results will be incomplete. The consultation is flawed - the public cannot readily find the information needed to make informed comments.

Change To Plan:

All documents should be properly text searchable / readable by a text reader for people with impaired vision. The documents and accessibility issues should be fixed and the consultation should be restarted.

[More details about Rep ID: 24362](#)

Representation ID: [24352](#)

**OBJECT** Claire Longmoor

Summary:

I object to the plans to extract sand and gravel at Barton in Fabis because of the habitat destruction this will cause and the disturbance to the existing wildlife at Attenborough Nature Reserve

Change To Plan:

Pleasr reconsider this proposal

[More details about Rep ID: 24352](#)

Representation ID: [24339](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

To access and read ALL relevant documents and respond online you need exceptional perseverance, fast broadband, good eyesight and manual dexterity. The closest approach of the Coddington MP2o site to the village envelope has sheltered accommodation and an estate with high proportions of senior residents - currently without high-speed broadband access. My husband is the village Digital Champion - because we found the 2013 online response system difficult (and had to help neighbours) we delivered a 2-sheet summary and simplified paper form to residents most affected by MP2o. Representation 24046 is from a Coddington resident using that form.

Change To Plan:

Library provision of all printed documents and large posters are still important for equal assessibility. A summary of the main points in plain English and large font with map should be made available about each site local to the public library. A set of digital files printed on-demand with a large poster informing the public of the service would suffice.

[More details about Rep ID: 24339](#)

Representation ID: [24337](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

NCC have a duty to ensure that public consultations are effective by informing people about large developments like this in their area, using paper copies and by briefing newspapers etc in addition to online media. To emphasise the significance of the proposed 127 Ha quarry at Coddington, a new quarry of area > 25 Ha is treated as a Schedule 1 development under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, the same as a new nuclear power plant - so should be taken very seriously.

Change To Plan:

The MLP consultation should be restarted, ensuring Public Libraries should have at least one set of ALL the documents printed out with posters informing the public that they are available for reference.

[More details about Rep ID: 24337](#)

Representation ID: [24324](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The website said that information panels would be placed at Newark Library, with a manned 2-hour slot on 19th June. On 20th June Coddington residents found two small posters - one gave a map about 2 sites. There was no plan on display showing the largest new proposed site at Coddington (127Ha) - 4 miles from the library and surely of equal concern to Newark hinterland citizens as the maps showing Flash Farm Averham (new 47.6Ha) the Langford Extensions (119.5. Ha total) with Cromwell S (39Ha). Officers have not given equal access to information about all sites in the area.

Change To Plan:

The MLP consultation process should be restarted - there appears to be a bias against providing open information locally to the public about the Coddington site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24324](#)

Representation ID: [24323](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

Key documents required for an effective and open consultation process have not been made publicly available. These include the Strategic Traffic Assessment and the Health Impact Assessment. The lack of these key documents have invalidated the public consultation process, as local Coddington residents deserve to have ready access when commenting on such a major long term 20 year quarry development (300 acres) proposed as close as 100m to their doorsteps.

Change To Plan:

The MLP consultation process should halted and restarted when the key supporting documents are all in place, to ensure a valid and open consultation with the public.

[More details about Rep ID: 24323](#)

Representation ID: [24322](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

When we visited Newark Library to look at the MLP Display the Librarian pointed to 2 posters and seeing our disbelief found a printed copy of the May 14 Sand and Gravel document and three documents from previous consultations. The information available was not sufficient to provide informed comment on the proposals. The Council had clearly not made sufficient effort to ensure that people reliant on physical rather than internet based-information routes had not been disadvantaged.

Change To Plan:

The MLP consultation process should be restarted - the public are not being consulted with in the accessible way expected from NCC. The consultation is discriminating against the elderly as only very limited information is being made available locally in paper form.

[More details about Rep ID: 24322](#)

Representation ID: [24321](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The website said that information panels would be placed at Newark Library, with a manned 2-hour slot on 19th June. On 20th June Coddington residents found two small posters - one gave a map about 2 sites. There was no plan on display showing the largest new proposed site at Coddington (127Ha) - 4 miles from the library and surely of equal concern to Newark hinterland citizens as the maps showing Flash Farm Averham (new 47.6Ha) the Langfield Extensions (119.5. Ha total) with Cromwell S (39Ha). Officers have not given equal access to information about all sites in the area.

Change To Plan:

The MLP consultation process should be restarted - there appears to be a bias against providing open information locally to the public about the Coddington site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24321](#)

Representation ID: [24200](#)

COMMENT Anglian Water Services Limited (Katie Clark)

Summary:

We have no comments to add to those made by use during previous consultations.

[More details about Rep ID: 24200](#)

Representation ID: [24102](#)

COMMENT Marine Management Organisation (General Enquiries)

Summary:

The MMO would recommend reference to marine aggregates in the plan and highlights:

- The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5, highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.
- The NPPF sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.
- The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) includes specific references to the role of

marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.

The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply. The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions - including marine.

This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the roll that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play - particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.

Change To Plan:

Add reference to marine aggregates in the plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24102](#)

Representation ID: [24100](#)

COMMENT The Coal Authority (Rachael Bust)

Summary:

Having reviewed the document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.

[More details about Rep ID: 24100](#)

Representation ID: [24049](#)

**OBJECT** Mr E Julian Coles

Summary:

We have already challenged the process in relation to the failure of the County Council to make any attempt to consult with or indeed advise the Parish council of the potential for a site at Barton. The response from the Corporate Director for Policy, Planning and Corporate Services has been that this would have been "inappropriate" which is both insulting and unacceptable, since dialogue has clearly been had with the landowners and their Planning Advisers 'Greenfield Associates' for some time and we are the elected representatives of your council tax payers. Ms.Francis- Ward has failed to reply to two further emails on this subject - again wholly unacceptable.

This is not an 'Additional Consultation' on the Barton site and It is fundamentally unacceptable and discriminatory that other areas have had opportunities to prepare their arguments over a considerable period prior to the 2013 consultation period and now have an additional period in which to do so again, whereas we have 8 weeks from start to finish to develop arguments around a proposal which is literally 'life changing' for residents of Barton. Please also note that the Preferred Approach Additional Consultation document and the Minerals Plan website confusingly continue to refer to a six week consultation period but give the dates as May 14 to July 11.

The points above are evidence of incompetent behaviour by your officers and sufficient grounds on their own to challenge the soundness of the process.

[More details about Rep ID: 24049](#)

Representation ID: [24048](#)

**OBJECT** Mr E Julian Coles

Summary:

The failure to provide any justification or full assessment for the major changes in terms of the deletion of key sites and the introduction of the Barton in Fabis site undermines the whole basis of the new Preferred Approach. It also makes it impossible for us to argue against the last minute adoption of the Barton in Fabis site if no rationale or sufficient assessment has been provided for either adoption or the deletion of other sites, thereby invalidating the consultation. Councillors on the Environment and Sustainability (May 8th) were not provided with sufficient information on which to make a sound decision on the content of and justification for the 'new' Preferred Approach Additional Consultation and indeed were given the impression that a full assessment had been made of the Barton in Fabis site, which is clearly not the case as outlined above.

[More details about Rep ID: 24048](#)

Representation ID: [24046](#)

COMMENT Mr Thomas J Parish

Summary:

I note that in a broad black print it states that this is the last chance to have our say on this new quarry. I'm sorry to say that this is the first instance of this coming to my attention. When did it last get printed?

[More details about Rep ID: 24046](#)

Representation ID: [23998](#)

COMMENT National Grid Plc represented by AMEC (Julian Austin)

Summary:

General information submitted on the role of National Grid and relationship to Local Plan process - welcomes being consulted.

[More details about Rep ID: 23998](#)

Representation ID: [23992](#)

COMMENT Nottinghamshire Building Preservation Trust Limited (Mr D Atkins)

Summary:

Thank you for the notification on the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This Trust has no detailed observations to make.

[More details about Rep ID: 23992](#)

Representation ID: [23987](#)

**OBJECT** Mr E Julian Coles represented by Ken Mafham Associates (Ken Mafham)

Summary:

We have looked briefly at the update of the March 2014 Local Aggregates Assessment. We note that there is a 6.7 year supply compared with a requirement of 7 years. On this basis the shortfall is marginal. Our calculation makes the supply 7.3 years at the current ten year moving average. There is an 11 years supply at the current three year moving average. Furthermore the assessment says that three permitted sand and gravel sites are not currently being worked. There is no justification in terms of shortage of capacity that justifies the circumvention of proper planning procedures entailed in the Environment and Sustainability Committee report.

[More details about Rep ID: 23987](#)

Representation ID: [23986](#)

**OBJECT** Mr E Julian Coles represented by Ken Mafham Associates (Ken Mafham)

Summary:

The additional consultation is not that, it is a significant change to the Preferred Approach. The inclusion of Barton sites is not only a new site, it is a change in strategic direction. This is a key stage in the Local Plan process and there needs to be a fully justified evidence base. It must follow the National Planning Policy Framework, including the 'Plan Making' section, section 13 dealing with minerals and para 150 'Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities'.

[More details about Rep ID: 23986](#)

Representation ID: [23985](#)

**OBJECT** Mr E Julian Coles represented by Ken Mafham Associates (Ken Mafham)

Summary:

The Minerals Local Plan as proposed to be changed by the Report to Environment and Sustainability Committee will be unsound due to the lack of an adequate evidence base. It will not be legally compliant due to the failure to follow the NPPF.

Public consultation will be flawed due to the short time period allowed and the lack of information as to alternatives. In addition to all this, the report itself does not comply with legal requirements concerning the availability of background papers.

[More details about Rep ID: 23985](#)

Representation ID: [23982](#)

SUPPORT Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (Local Development Framework)

Summary:

From a minerals policy stance Doncaster Council is fully supportive of the proposed changes and additions to your site proposals.

[More details about Rep ID: 23982](#)

Representation ID: [23981](#)

COMMENT North Yorkshire County Council (Mr Rob Smith)

Summary:

Thank you for informing us of this consultation. We do not wish to make any comments.

[More details about Rep ID: 23981](#)

Representation ID: [24467](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford)

Summary:

9 CONCLUSION

Taking into account the evidence presented on access above it is evident that Shelford West should be allocated on the basis of its SA score (as determined by the County) compared with other sites. In particular Barton in Fabis and Averham should not be allocated on the basis of their SA score and access respectively. Neither Shelford site should be discounted on the basis of access.

Change To Plan:

As listed within the text above, removing Barton in Fabis and Averham from allocated sites list and replacing them with Shelford East and Shelford West as preferred sites

[More details about Rep ID: 24467](#)

**The summary & change to plan above is misleading as it should have referenced Shelford sites replacing Coddington as well as Barton in Fabis and Averham! The full representation is given below, with references to Coddington highlighted in yellow.**

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brett Aggregates Ltd (BAL) is the wholly owned subsidiary company of Robert Brett and Sons Limited (Brett), the aggregates, building materials and civil engineering independent business, which was established over a century ago. It is the largest independent producer of sand and gravel in the UK.

1.2 BAL manages all Brett's quarry, marine dredged aggregate, recycled aggregates and coated stone operations.

1.3 Nottinghamshire County Council (the County) recently published the Minerals Local Plan - Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision, seeking representations on this document together with revised background documents by 11th July 2014.

1.4 The present consultation on Sand and Gravel provision includes 2 additional new sites at Barton in Fabis near Nottingham and Averham near Newark (Flash Farm) a further extension to the west of Langford Lowfields Quarry and the deletion of the previously identified western extension to Girton Quarry. Further changes provide for amended boundaries at Langford Lowfields South, Barnby Moor and Bawtry Road North.

1.5 BAL's interest in Nottinghamshire is in respect of two sites at Shelford. These sites represent a significant sand and gravel resource, the future development of which will ensure that Nottinghamshire, in particular the south of the County including Nottingham itself, is able to meet a steady and adequate supply of aggregates throughout the plan period whilst minimizing the amount of mineral miles travelled on the County's road network together with providing the ability for some mineral to be transported into the City using barges. That accords with guidance in the recently published National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which advises mineral planning authorities to 'plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates...'. .

1.6 The Site Selection Update - Sand and Gravel May 2014 background document specifically refers to the reasons for the proposed changes and the revisions made to the assessment of the Shelford sites as a result of submissions made to the MLPPA in December 2013.

1.7 The comments made in this submission relate only to the changes proposed to be made to the MLPPA in respect of sand and gravel provision and do not alter Brett's previously made submissions where these have not been addressed by the proposed amendments. It is, therefore, necessary to read both the current submission together with that submitted by BAL in December 2013 in response to the Council's consultation on the entire MLPPA. The current document is set out in a similar format to that submitted in Dec 2013 in order that a direct comparison can be made.

1.8 The following Appendices to the BAL submission made in Dec 2013 have been amended and are attached.

Distribution Map. The site at Girton has been deleted and additions have been made at Barton in Fabis and Averham (Flash Farm) to reflect the changes now proposed by the County

Table 3. Revision A shows the amended distribution of proposed allocated sand and gravel reserves by area

Table 4. Revision A shows the amended distribution of proposed allocated and permitted sand and gravel reserves. The permitted reserves are based on the Council's Delivery Schedule May 2014.

New Table 10, BAL Deliverability Schedule. This takes the County's table and provides totals on an annual basis.

Email exchange between BAL highway engineers and Notts CC highway engineers.

## **2 VISION.**

2.1 The current consultation does not propose any amendments to this section of the MLPPA, therefore, BAL's previous submissions in this respect remain outstanding.

## **3 AGGREGATE PROVISION**

3.1 The current consultation does not address the concerns raised by BAL in December 2013 in respect of aggregate provision in the MLPPA. The objections made by BAL at that time in respect of the requirement remain outstanding. The aggregate provision now proposed is lower than that set out in the MLPPA 2013 (see Table 4 rev A appended and below at Section 4).

## **4 DISTRIBUTION**

4.1 Marginal adjustments have been made to the distribution of the sand and gravel across the County with a slight increase in reserves in the south of the County.

4.2 The total of permitted reserves available during the plan period together with proposed allocations amounts to 47.16MT. It remains BAL's case that the apportionment should be 3.25MTPA and that the total allocated reserves over the 18 year plan period should, therefore, be 58.50 MT. Previously the % reserves either permitted and available in the plan period proposed for the Newark area was 62% of this total with 6.7% allocated in the South Notts area and the remainder in North Notts. The situation now proposed by the County is that 68% (See Table 4 rev a ( $31.97/47.16 \times 100$ )) of the reserves for the plan period are either permitted or allocated in the Newark area and 13 % in the South Notts area (See

Table 4 rev a (6.04/47.16 x 100). Despite the small increase in reserves proposed for South Notts the bulk of the allocations remain in the Newark area whilst the majority of the development proposed (see BAL Dec 2013 submission) is in the South Notts area.

4.3 From the evidence in Tables 3 rev a and 4 rev a it can be seen that the allocation of the Barton in Fabis and Flash Farm sites has done little to amend the distribution of mineral which remains too skewed towards the Newark area and which will result in an unacceptable level of overall mineral miles being travelled. Furthermore, the actual contribution which the Barton in Fabis site is capable of making to the overall landbank is disputed, see below.

4.4 The previous submissions by BAL regarding this issue remain.

## 5 SITE ASSESSMENT

5.1 BAL maintains a fundamental objection to the method by which the sites have been assessed. In particular to the failure to properly assess the environmental implications of the distribution of the sites with insufficient allocations being provided in the South Notts area. Specifically the Sustainability Assessment on which the site assessment is based has failed to make any analysis concerning the air quality and carbon footprint of the proposed allocation distribution and the consequent emissions from HGVs travelling around the County as a result of this distribution.

5.2 These issues were raised by BAL in December 2013 and again at a meeting with the Council Planners in June. At the June meeting planners advised that they were unable to carry out any such assessment unless operators advised as to where their markets are located. This is not the correct approach. For a plan to be sound it must be based on appropriate information. It is not necessary for a detailed assessment on a site by site basis to be analysed but that a broad approach to distribution should be adopted. The evidence previously submitted by BAL in respect of the distribution of housing requirement around the County compared with the proposed distribution of sand and gravel reserves is a good indicator of the current problem with the MLPPA site distribution. The current position following the revisions now subject to consultation is set out below.

### **Table A** District S and G

(See Above) Housing requirement per annum (see Table 2 of Dec 2013 submission)

Newark area Newark and Sherwood 62% 16%

South Notts Nottingham City, Gedling, Broxtowe, Rushcliffe 7% 56%

North Notts Bassetlaw, Mansfield, Ashfield 21% 18%

5.3 It is clear that the spatial imbalance between supply and demand remains and in this respect BAL's original objections are maintained in full. It is unfortunate that the Council have not recognised the shortcomings of the SA and SEA in this respect and have not used the opportunity of the current re consultation to address these issues which are fundamental to the soundness of the Plan.

5.4 With regard to the Council's revised site scoring on its own assessment Shelford West scores -9 which is less than the Barton in Fabis score of -12. It is the same as both Flash Farm and Coddington. In the Site Selection Update for Sand and Gravel (May 2014, page 16) both the Shelford West and East sites are stated as not being allocated, despite acknowledgement that there has been significant reduction in their overall SA site assessment scores, as having unacceptable access arrangements which would be "difficult" to overcome. It should be noted that the reasons for this new finding against the Shelford

sites, was not advised by the planning officers between the 2013 consultation which found site access to both sites acceptable and the 2014 re consultation when it was found by the Council to be insurmountable (see Site Assessment document). Recent discussions directly with the County Highway Engineers have demonstrated that by way of on-site conveyors, both Shelford West and East can be accessed from the A6097 (see appended email exchange). The conveyor from the Shelford West site will pass under Manor Lane and will be counter sunk across the land between Manor Lane and the A6097 thereby reducing any environmental impact to a minimum. In this way the two Shelford sites can be considered independently of each other.

5.5 It is also the case that both Shelford sites (Shelford East by way of conveyor into Shelford West) can deliver aggregate by barge. Advanced negotiations are underway with The Canal and River Trust (formerly British Waterways) in respect of a wharf in Nottingham. It is intended that two concrete batching plants can be set up at the wharf which is on an industrial estate with direct access onto the strategic road network. Each batching plant will take 60,000 tpa of aggregate from Shelford. This will mean that 120,000 tpa of the total output of 300,000 tpa will go by barge into Nottingham. Due to the lock system it is understood that the Newark sites do not have access to the higher reaches of the Trent and, therefore, cannot use barges to access the south of the County. This is a significant advantage for the Shelford sites and is not reflected in the SA scoring.

5.6 Furthermore, taking into account the major skew in respect of the distribution which has resulted in the vast majority of the mineral being allocated in the Newark area whilst the majority of the development is expected to be in the South Notts area (see previous submission concerning mineral miles) it should be noted that the Shelford West site has a similar score (-9) to Coddington,

5.7 Finally, with regard to the site assessment it is BAL's case that the Barton in Fabis and Coddington sites have not been assessed correctly. The SNCIs which are currently part of both sites will be lost. Both Shelford sites have been designed to avoid the local SNCIs. Therefore, the Shelford sites should be preferred to both the Coddington and Barton in Fabis sites. Furthermore, in respect of the Barton in Fabis site, if the SNCIs are avoided then potentially the yield from the site will be reduced by 50% (see below). The ecology score for Barton in Fabis should reflect this impact. This will further negatively impact on distribution of the mineral across the County, with a reduction in that available in the South Notts area.

## **6 BARTON IN FABIS**

6.1 Brandshill Grassland SNCI is wholly contained within the proposed allocation site and presumably would therefore be entirely destroyed by the proposals. A significant ecological impact even if it is not of SSSI quality.

6.2 In addition to the designations, the map extract shows the extent of BAP habitats in the locality from DEFRA's MAGIC website. There is an area of grazing marsh BAP habitat present outside of the designated areas in the southwest corner. When combined we calculate that approximately 50% of the site is constrained due to these features.

6.3 In the County's assessment Barton in Fabis is scored as -2 for biodiversity in the operational period as is Shelford West. How can this be correct when the Shelford West site's operation proposals have demonstrated that direct impact on the SNCIs (land take) can be avoided. Furthermore, there is no long term biodiversity score for Barton in Fabis, it is in a similar position to Shelford West and must be given by the County a similar score that is -1. This will further reduce the overall score for this site against the Shelford sites. Finally,

with respect to the nearby Attenborough and Holme Pit SSSI sites and hydrological impact it is the case that without substantive evidence that the proposed mineral extraction can be undertaken without detriment to the ecology of the designated areas then on a precautionary basis the Barton in Fabis site should not be allocated.

6.4 In respect of access a land search for the Barton in Fabis site shows that there is no operator agreement in place which is registered against the land. Furthermore, the land immediately adjacent to the A453 is not within the same ownership as that where the majority of the mineral lies, potentially causing a ransom situation which it may not be possible to overcome, thereby, rendering the site undeliverable.

## **7 AVERHAM | NEAR NEWARK (FLASH FARM)**

7.1 This site has major access difficulties concerning traffic through Southwell and also the bottleneck at the Kelham Bridge. These concerns are not capable of being overcome by the operator or landowner and should cause the site not to be allocated.

## **8 SITE DELIVERABILITY**

8.1 The 'Deliverability Schedule' within the 'Delivery Schedule - Sand and Gravel Background Paper May 2014', lists the existing sites, extensions and new sites being proposed and when they are estimated to be delivered over the plan period. However, the table does not total the annual production figures of all of the sites to identify if the apportionment is capable of being met.

8.2 We have prepared our own version of this 'Delivery Schedule', which is attached to this response as Table 10. Totals have been summed for each year and it is evident that the annual apportionment which the County considers as appropriate (2.65mt) is not capable of being met until at least 2019. The annual apportionment which BAL considers necessary, that is 3.35MT (see BAL Dec 2013 submission), will never be achieved during the plan period. It is, therefore, concluded that even should the County not delete any of the existing sites from the allocation currently proposed further sites are needed and these need to be new sites which can start to deliver early in the plan period and not extensions which will be delayed as existing reserves are worked out. In the sites available to the County, and which are not currently allocated, the Shelford sites are the lowest scoring and contribute to the South Notts area where the distribution shortfall occurs.

Both Shelford sites should be preferred to Coddington because of the need to move allocation from the Newark area to the South Notts area and in order to provide for a sustainable pattern of aggregate delivery to areas proposed for development.

Currently in the MLPPA there is inadequate provision both overall and to meet the annual apportionment. More new sites are needed and in view of their favourable site score both Shelford sites should be allocated.

It is, therefore, BAL's case that the two Shelford sites should replace Coddington, Barton in Fabis and Averham in the allocations irrespective of any minor difference in the SA score, which may be identified by the County in order to address the spatial imbalance between aggregate and planned development distribution as previously set out in the BAL Dec 2013 submission.

## MP2: Sand and gravel provision

Representation ID: [25720](#)

SUPPORT Cemex UK operations (Kirsten Hannaford-Hill)

Summary:

The Company welcomes the inclusion of East Leake SGk for the extraction of remaining reserves. The operations and restoration of the mineral sites contained within the policy shall take into account the relevant site development brief contained within Appendix 2.

[More details about Rep ID: 25720](#)

Representation ID: [25698](#)

COMMENT English Heritage (Ms Claire Searson)

Summary:

We have previously made comment on Policy MP2, the proposed allocations and their development brief's in our response to you in December 2013. Where no changes have been made, we defer to our comments submitted at that time.

[More details about Rep ID: 25698](#)

Representation ID: [25653](#)

COMMENT Rushcliffe Borough Council (David Mitchell)

Summary:

Whilst the Borough Council acknowledge and support the requirement of the County Council to identify allocations for minerals extraction in line with paragraph 145 of the NPPF. Concerns in relation to site selection process and the evidence base behind it. The Borough Council support the omission of Shelford West and Shelford East as allocations on transport and accessibility grounds.

Change To Plan:

Further consideration should be given to the site selection process, in particular relating to environmental sensitivity and choice of sites.

[More details about Rep ID: 25653](#)

Representation ID: [25493](#)

**OBJECT** Lafarge Tarmac represented by Heaton Planning Ltd (Mr Spencer Warren)

Summary:

Our issues/concerns regard the following:

Continued shortfall of sand and gravel provision.

Omission of the Home Farm site (including the proposed allocation of Coddington and Flash Farm ahead of home farm contrary to the results of the Sustainability Appraisal.

Amendment to the boundary of the Besthorpe south allocation.

Change To Plan:

Council should accept that Home Farm is deliverable during plan period and that it represents a far more sustainable option than either Coddington or Flash Farm.

The plan should be amended to delete both the Coddington and Flash Farm allocations and allocate Home Farm.

[More details about Rep ID: 25493](#)

Representation ID: [25036](#)

COMMENT Bassetlaw District Council (Tom Bannister)

Summary:

The additional text at the end of this policy, binding the development briefs in appendix 2 to this policy (in line with the council's earlier consultation response), is noted and welcomed.

[More details about Rep ID: 25036](#)

NB – NONE OF THE MP2o SUBMISSIONS ABOVE HAVE ANY ATTACHMENTS AT 11.8.14

Some of the submissions already recorded below do have attachments at 11.8.14

Representation ID: [24714](#)

COMMENT Highways Agency (Susan Chambers)

Summary:

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the additional consultation on sand and gravel provision document. It had limited comments to provide with regard to the previous consultation document and considers this still to be the case in relation to this latest consultation document.

The Agency is keen to maintain its engagement with Nottinghamshire County Council as it takes forward its Minerals Local Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24714](#)

Attached Representation:

Chambers, Susan

Sent: 08 July 2014 10:51

To: Development Planning

Subject: Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan Additional Consultation

Attachments: 140707 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan Additional Consultation Tech Note.pdf

Susan Chambers, Asset Manager, Highways Agency | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN

Tel: +44 (0) 121 6788201, Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk>

GTN: 6189 8201

Project: Highways Agency Spatial Planning Arrangement Job No: 60318047 - Subject: Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan – Additional Consultation

Date: 07/07/2014

HA ref: EM 72 14/15 Task: 5202

## 1. Introduction

Nottinghamshire County Council has published its Minerals Local Plan – Additional Consultation on

Sand and Gravel Provision document. This has been prepared in response to public consultation on the Preferred Approach in October 2013 which resulted in a number of concerns being raised with regard to the County's future Sand and Gravel provision. Despite a number of concerns being raised by other consultees, the Highways Agency (the Agency) had no specific concerns in relation to the proposals set out in the document.

## 2. Response

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan – Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision document. It is the role of the Agency to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In this respect, the HA's specific focus is on safeguarding the performance of the SRN which includes the M1, A1, A46, A52 and A453 routes which run through the Nottinghamshire county.

In its previous response to the Preferred Approach document, the Agency raised no significant concerns and supported the inclusion of policies which recognised the potential impacts of large volumes of HGV's utilising the highway network and which put forward sustainable solutions such as the transportation of minerals via alternative modes. It also had limited comments in relation to the proposed sites put forward for consultation. The Agency notes that two additional sites; one at Barton-in-Fabis and the other at Flash Farm, Aversham have been put forward in the Additional Consultation document whilst a further extension to the west of Langford Lowfields quarry is proposed.

The Agency assumes that the additional sites would also be the subject of a Transport Assessment, as is stated in Policy SP5 of the Preferred Approach document. The site at Barton-in-Fabis is close to the A453 which is currently the subject of a major improvement scheme. The Agency accepts that minerals are a finite resource and can only be worked where they are found but considers that, where a Transport Assessment reveals that HGV traffic generated from a site would have a severe impact on the SRN, an appropriate package of mitigation measures would need to be considered.

As part of the need to consider sustainable development within the planning process, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Agency also considers that the distance travelled and direction taken by HGVs transporting minerals should be taken into account. It is acknowledged that sand and gravel are relatively low cost minerals and therefore not cost effective to transport over long distances. Nevertheless, it is important that Transport Assessments for such mineral extraction developments give the distance travelled and direction taken by the HGVs due regard in order for them to provide a robust assessment of the likely traffic impacts on the highway network.

## 3. Summary

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan – Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision document. It had limited comments to provide with regard to the previous consultation document and considers this still to be the case in relation to this latest consultation document.

The Agency is keen to maintain its engagement with Nottinghamshire County Council as it begins the preparation of the Submission Draft consultation document which will constitute

the final stage of public consultation prior to submission to the Planning Inspectorate for examination and formal adoption.

Prepared by Checked by: .....  
Darren Abberley Tim McCann, Consultant Principal Consultant  
Approved by:.... ..  
Graham Fry, Associate Director  
Technical Note

Direct Tel: 0121 262 1954  
T +44 (0)121 262 1900  
F +44 (0)121 262 1999  
E Darren.Abberley@aecom.com  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com), Colmore Plaza, Colmore Circus Queensway, Birmingham B4 6AT  
Page: 2 of 2 Doc. 363 July 2014

F:\TP\PROJECT\Traffic - HASPA\5200 - Derbys-Notts SP\5202 Nottinghamshire\2 - Tech Notes\140707 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan Additional Consultation Tech Note.docx

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AL") for the sole use of our Client (the "Client") and in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AL and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AL, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AL.

Representation ID: [24728](#)

**COMMENT** R.S.P.B. (Central Region) (Carl Cornish)

Summary:

For sites adjacent to the River Trent to be considered for connection with the river to create backwaters and be part of river habitat restoration.

Change To Plan:

Propose sites adjacent to the River Trent to be considered for connection with the river to create backwaters and be part of river habitat restoration.

[More details about Rep ID: 24728](#)

Representation ID: [24714](#)

**COMMENT** Highways Agency (Susan Chambers)

Summary:

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the additional consultation on sand and gravel provision document. It had limited comments to provide with regard to the previous consultation document and considers this still to be the case in relation to this latest consultation document.

The Agency is keen to maintain its engagement with Nottinghamshire County Council as it takes forward its Minerals Local Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24714](#)

Representation ID: [24660](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Philip Bell represented by Fisher German LLP (Mr William Gagie)

Summary:

We believe the proposal allocated insufficient reserves to cover demand during the plan period and that further allocations are required.

We believe that the proven reserve at Manor Farm, Spalford should be allocated to meet likely demand during the plan period and to provide the new plan with the flexibility given the problems with the proven deliverability of some sites with existing consents.

Change To Plan:

The above site will bring the necessary flexibility to the reserve allocation in the minerals plan providing as it does a proven reserve of 7 million tonnes of sand and gravel.

Furthermore its location in the north of the county gives it the flexibility to supply markets either within Nottinghamshire or, as is currently the case with much of the material dug in Nottinghamshire, to be delivered to Yorkshire and Humberside. The site could either be operated as an extension to Girton (and the operator of that site has shown interest in the past) or has the flexibility to open as a new greenfield site given the excellent road links it enjoys.

As you are no doubt aware Lafarge/Tarmac are currently in merger talks with Holcim, who operate as Aggregate Industries in the UK. As a result of the uncertainty this has created they have placed on hold any further mineral developments until the size and structure of the new merged company is better understood. This does not mean that they have turned their backs on this site but it does represent an opportunity for a new independent operator to take it forward if it should be allocated.

The minerals extraction industry is currently undergoing a period of change with a number of smaller medium sized operators entering the market to compete with the long established major firms who for some time have dominated the market. A site such as Manor Farm, Spalford offers the opportunity for such a small or medium sized operator to enter the market should Tarmac not wish to pursue their interest further.

In the past the site has been downgraded due to the lack of a fully committed operator, although as stated above there were discussions with Tarmac. We do not feel that this should represent a material consideration in the allocation of preferred areas and that if a site is suitable and the reserves are required to fulfil the land bank requirements then it should be allocated, especially given the changes the industry is undergoing and the prospects of finding a new and independent operator.

[More details about Rep ID: 24660](#)

Representation ID: [24657](#)

**OBJECT** Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen) (Representing Brett Aggregates)

Summary:

My representation regarding the Shelford proposal:

1. Acceptable site access has now been agreed with the Highways Authority

2. Proposal now includes to ability to transport some mineral by barge
3. The results of the consultation have been pre-determined.
4. Both Barton in Fabis and Coddington have SINCs within the boundaries. Not the case with Shelford.
5. The mineral reserves estimates put forward by other operators cannot be verified as detailed borehole information not supplied. Not the case with the Shelford.
6. Shelford would supply Nottingham market reducing lorry miles/ air pollution.

[More details about Rep ID: 24657](#)

Representation ID: [24598](#)

**OBJECT** Gill Venables and 1 other

Summary:

We were very displeased to come home and find this information relating to a proposed new quarry being built on our doorstep. We specifically chose this area to live due to the quieter location whilst still being within good transport links. We are just about to start a family and do not want our children to be unable to play on the local parks due to excessive disruption noise and dust pollution that would be created from this. Please take this as our objection to this work being carried out. We are against this proposal completely!

[More details about Rep ID: 24598](#)

Representation ID: [24573](#)

**OBJECT** Mr G Walker

Summary:

Local Minerals Plan, Newark

The proposed development will totally change the local environment. The road system is not adequate for the purpose, the noise, the dust and general workings will destroy the northern part of Newark.

From an environmental point of view Newark has suffered too much in recent years, this development is going too far. It must be stopped.

[More details about Rep ID: 24573](#)

Representation ID: [24518](#)

**OBJECT** Kelham Estate represented by Savills (Mr Martin Ott)

Summary:

We object to the omission of Home Farm, Kelham as an allocated site. We are firmly of the view that the site is deliverable in the plan period. The site is well located to serve Nottingham and south Nottinghamshire. Other proposed allocations can only serve north Nottinghamshire.

Home Farm represents a more sustainable option than the new proposed sites at Coddington and Flash Farm. This is clearly shown on the Council's own sustainability appraisal (May 2014).

Change To Plan:

Allocate Home Farm, Kelaham as a new sand and gravel site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24518](#)

Representation ID: [24517](#)

**OBJECT** Kelham Estate represented by Savills (Mr Martin Ott)

Summary:

There will be a shortfall in sand and gravel provision during the plan period. MP2 states that the plan needs to provide 49 million tonnes of sand and gravel during the plan period. The Council's schedule only identifies 47 million tonnes. We are also seeing a substantial pick up in construction activity and the plan should make additional allowance for this.

The Council's schedule does not provide for the annual apportionment to be met until 2019 which means that there will be a substantial shortfall in supply in the early part of the plan period.

Change To Plan:

To allocate Home Farm, Kelham as a new sand and gravel site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24517](#)

Representation ID: [24489](#)

**OBJECT** Trustees of Home Farm, Kelham represented by Savills (Mr Martin Ott)

Summary:

There will be a shortfall in sand and gravel provision during the plan period. MP2 states that the plan needs to provide 49 million tonnes of sand and gravel during the plan period. The Council's schedule only identifies 47 million tonnes. This makes no allowance for the increase in demand for aggregates as construction activity picks up.

The Council's schedule does not provide for the annual apportionment to be met until 2019 which means there will be a shortfall in supply.

Change To Plan:

To allocate Home Farm, Kelham as a new sand and gravel site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24489](#)

Representation ID: [24431](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Euan Corrie

Summary:

I object to extension of quarrying at Sturton, Girton, Besthorpe, Langford or Cromwell until enforceable agreement is made with the operators that water transport will be used from these sites.

The Canal & River Trust must be compelled to allow proper dredging of the bed of the Trent to win sand and gravel and improve flood water discharge.

Change To Plan:

No permission should be granted at Sturton, Girton, Besthorpe, Langford or Cromwell until the above agreements are in place.

The plan must be co-ordinated with the County's flood prevention planning and sand and gravel consequently removed from the river Trent bed and not from green field sites.

[More details about Rep ID: 24431](#)

Representation ID: [24400](#)

COMMENT Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA) (Richard Horne)

Summary:

I have the following points about potential use of barge transport:

4) Girton - this site has used barge transport previously; would need a new wharf however, but this should still be considered for viability should the extension for extraction be gained to 2030.

[More details about Rep ID: 24400](#)

Representation ID: [24396](#)

COMMENT Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA) (Richard Horne)

Summary:

I have the following points about potential use of barge transport:

2) Sturton le Steeple - I understand that for some time Lafarge have been aware of the possibility of using barge transport here.

[More details about Rep ID: 24396](#)

Representation ID: [24394](#)

COMMENT Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA) (Richard Horne)

Summary:

I note that in the Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision, barge transport is mentioned for the Besthorpe quarries, but I could not see this elsewhere. I have the following points about potential use of barge transport for Cromwell, Sturton le Steeple, Langford, Girton, Barton in Fabis, Kelham (details listed under each sites) and Lockington - this does not appear to be mentioned in the document. If it is opened in the future, it is another waterside site that can be barged from.

Change To Plan:

The point we would like to request with this Additional Consultation is to make the water transport element included as part of the transport approach with the future minerals provision plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24394](#)

Representation ID: [24385](#)

COMMENT Mr J Potter

Summary:

On the wider issue of proposed-provision (MP2), that a third to a half of amount extracted would be for elsewhere - while Nottinghamshire ,& NG11 Nottm., would endure the-impacts - the county's Authorities ought instead to respect here community wishes first &

foremost - rather than: pressing-on as exploitative-businesses in unduly-aiding the construction-sector.

[More details about Rep ID: 24385](#)

## [MP: Sand and gravel - MP2o Coddington](#)

Representation ID: [25747](#)

**OBJECT** Newark and Sherwood District Council (Matthew Tubb)

Summary:

The District Council still has severe concerns over the cumulative transport impact on the A1/A46/A17 junctions from the proposed quarry at Coddington.

[More details about Rep ID: 25747](#)

Representation ID: [25742](#)

**OBJECT** Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Janice Bradley)

Summary:

NWT welcomes the revised site allocation brief however we note that provision remains to take account of the higher quality agricultural soils in the restoration scheme, in accordance with the proposed policy DM3, and our comments remain as previously submitted.

NWT would expect to see either the allocation boundary drawn back at least 30m from the woodland edge, or specific reference in the brief to a minimum of a 30m stand off, from the SINC/LWS of any operational activities, including soil storage mounds.

Change To Plan:

NWT would expect to see either the allocation boundary drawn back at least 30m from the woodland edge, or specific reference in the brief to a minimum of a 30m stand off, from the SINC/LWS of any operational activities, including soil storage mounds.

[More details about Rep ID: 25742](#)

Representation ID: [25695](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs R Masding and 1 other

Summary:

We object on the following grounds:

- Too close proximity to areas of population/amenities, woodland areas and wildlife
- Loss of quality farmland and ruination of local environment (in contrast to Government green and eco-friendly initiatives)
- Noise and air pollution
- Traffic congestion
- Impact on woodland and wildlife
- Loss of a very valuable and irreplaceable amenity
- Many negative impacts on the environment and no positive impacts whatsoever

[More details about Rep ID: 25695](#)

Representation ID: [25689](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Arkley

Summary:

Obviously certain landowners have agreed in principle to the fact that their land will be affected by the extraction of the sand and gravel. I would therefore think that a compensation settlement has been agreed between both parties. I would like to ask if property owners are to be compensated if or when they come to sell at a later date. As surely the area and house prices will too be considerably affected by the extraction site.

[More details about Rep ID: 25689](#)

Representation ID: [25688](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Arkley

Summary:

When the A17 bye pass was in the process of being built, we were subjected to noise from heavy construction traffic and the pumps used to keep water away from the building work. That noise was bad enough, but effects of the whine from the pumps reverberating through the ground and transmitting through the foundations was even worse. I can only think that pumps used on the extraction site will be more numerous and also a lot more powerful, so the white through the ground would be totally unacceptable.

[More details about Rep ID: 25688](#)

Representation ID: [25687](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Arkley

Summary:

The A17 bye pass is already experiencing very heavy traffic problems to the effect that some days bottlenecks at the A1, A17 and A46 roundabout near Currys distribution centre has traffic backed up to the Coddington roundabout and even further towards the golf course. The lorries and workforce using the extraction site will be caught up in the tailbacks along these main roads, which will mean they will use the village roads to get round the problems.

[More details about Rep ID: 25687](#)

Representation ID: [25686](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Arkley

Summary:

Area water drains into streams which go through the woods. Fishes of up to 5", frogs etc use these streams. Deer, muntjac, foxes, squirrels, rabbits, hares, badgers and various species of birds all live there. The eastern boundary wood has several owls and a group of buzzards which have only appeared in the last 2,3 years. A barn owl often hunts in the area of the roundabout. Obviously food is plentiful in the area or we wouldn't see them around. Consideration to conservation should be given as all these will be lost to the extraction site.

[More details about Rep ID: 25686](#)

Representation ID: [25685](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Arkley

Summary:

The constant noise from the pumps, conveyor systems, washers, scrubbers, heavy vehicles, generators and floodlight pollution, and also the noise of the rumbling gravel itself. Likewise the affects of the dust that will drift on the wind will be all over trees, grass, our homes, cars, windows, gardens, washing, and worst of all inside our lungs, eyes and on our skin.

[More details about Rep ID: 25685](#)

Representation ID: [25682](#)

**OBJECT** James Evans

Summary:

I object to the quarry for the following reasons:

The quarry would impact on the football field which is to the south east of the proposal. This would include a high level of noise and dust.

If the site was to be developed the site access, processing plant etc must be situated in the north west corner of the site to minimise disruption.

The A17 & A46 are already close to capacity. Quarry will result in a large increase in traffic and major holdups.

Sites should be developed closer to the main market of Nottingham, reducing HGV mileage and CO2

Change To Plan:

Reconsider your existing plans and consider implications of the quarry's development on our local community.

[More details about Rep ID: 25682](#)

Representation ID: [25677](#)

**OBJECT** Bob Overbury

Summary:

I object to the planned quarry as we do not want to put our health and the health of our baby daughter at risk from microscopic silica dust. History has proven that this dust will be a big problem if there is a quarry. I also object to 180 extra lorries per day on the A17 which is already at maximum capacity. The road simply cannot take it and neither can Coddington village.

[More details about Rep ID: 25677](#)

Representation ID: [25660](#)

**OBJECT** Sharon Patel

Summary:

Health issues

Quarry could easily become a flood risk

Traffic on A17

What are the re-route options when there is an accident on the A17

Sporting activities ruined as children will be breathing in dust

Further congestion on the main coastal road

Noise and vibrations from the quarry work  
Devaluation of property prices  
Consideration to the young clubs with outside activities  
Concern for woodland and wildlife  
Businesses affected as a result of the quarry  
Light pollution  
Impact of noise on residents  
Concerned about the hours of operation  
Change To Plan:  
Alternative site away from houses/villages. Possibly A46 northbound  
[More details about Rep ID: 25660](#)

Representation ID: [25656](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Sheila Tilley

Summary:

Health issues

Quarry could easily become a flood risk

Traffic on A17

What are the re-route options when there is an accident on the A17

Sporting activities ruined as children will be breathing in dust

Further congestion on the main coastal road

Noise and vibrations from the quarry work

Devaluation of property prices

Consideration to the young clubs with outside activities

Concern for woodland and wildlife

Businesses affected as a result of the quarry

Light pollution

Impact of noise on residents

Concerned about the hours of operation

[More details about Rep ID: 25656](#)

Representation ID: [25603](#)

**OBJECT** Mr FA Bower

Summary:

Appalled to receive notification of the proposed massive 300 acre sand and gravel quarry adjacent to our village of coddington which I vehemently appose.

This development because of its size and impact on the village, will destroy the natural growth and serenity of village life.

I sincerely hope, with the backing of the Parish Council and residents, we are able to quash the proposal and subsequent add-ons for all concerned.

[More details about Rep ID: 25603](#)

Representation ID: [25602](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Gary Bobby

Summary:

Absolutely appalled to receive this notification showing proposed quarry etc.

We oppose this totally 100%

Absolutely disgusted

Hopefully with the full backing of all concerned - homeowners, parish council etc this can be stopped immediately

[More details about Rep ID: 25602](#)

Representation ID: [25601](#)

**OBJECT** Pamela Coddington

Summary:

Blight on landscape

Dust and noise pollution

Health hazard with fine dust that settles on peoples lungs

Enough traffic without another 180 lorries plus workers transport

Property prices will fall, that's if we could sell.

[More details about Rep ID: 25601](#)

Representation ID: [25599](#)

**OBJECT** Albert Coddington

Summary:

A blight on the landscape

Dust not good for health

Noise and dust pollution on homes

Road chaos enough of that already in Newark

Loss of value of properties

[More details about Rep ID: 25599](#)

Representation ID: [25598](#)

**OBJECT** Michael Overbury

Summary:

Impact on traffic levels in the area

Threat to health and well being of residents in the village

Loss of house prices

Loss of important local amenity.

[More details about Rep ID: 25598](#)

Representation ID: [25597](#)

**OBJECT** Miss H Marshall

Summary:

I dont want HGV traffic commng through the village, the quarry will mean noise and dust pollution, damage to wildlife. It will also reduce the property prices

[More details about Rep ID: 25597](#)

Representation ID: [25548](#)

**OBJECT** John W Marshall

Summary:

Is this the right location? Why extract next to an existing community when materials are in abundance elsewhere. Site will create good profit for council, contractors and land owners but not local community.

Impact of noise, dust and traffic.

My argument is not one of 'not in my back yard, but an argument that no community or country amenity should be damaged quarrying. Materials are needed but this can be achieved at a significant distance from communities.

Impact on tigers football club, golf club and community housing development.

Health of your local constituents is top priority.

Impact on local economy

[More details about Rep ID: 25548](#)

Representation ID: [25534](#)

**OBJECT** Angela Latham

Summary:

Enough HGVs already in the area causing pollution without 180 extra. Not to mention traffic congestion.

Its a rural area and arable farming land should remain.

The earth has been vastly abused in this country already and this is yet another example.

Councils should take responsibility to promote our country and not approve such ventures.

This is based on appreciable financial gain to a group of individuals at the cost of a deficit to our earhand local people.

Lowering of house prices,

Noise and dust pollution.

[More details about Rep ID: 25534](#)

Representation ID: [25525](#)

**OBJECT** Michael Bassey and 66 others

Summary:

Petition - 67 signatures - We the residents of Beaconsfield Drive, Ordoyno Grove and Yew Tree Way living within a mile of the proposed coddington quarry are gravely concerned at the loss of amenity, health hazards of fine dust, expected continuous noise from machinery and potential traffic problems that will be caused by the quarry..

Change To Plan:

We urge the removal of Coddington, site PA10 from the Councils Minerals Local Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 25525](#)

Representation ID: [25429](#)

**OBJECT** Stig Wallinder and 1 other

Summary:

Too closely located to Coddington. Air, noise pollution. Increase traffic congestion. Becoming an eyesore.

Change To Plan:

Remove site MP20 from the Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 25429](#)

Representation ID: [25426](#)

**OBJECT** James Redfern

Summary:

As a family we are totally opposed to the development of the project.

Change To Plan:

Remove site MP20 from the Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 25426](#)

Representation ID: [25393](#)

**OBJECT** Karen Whitesmith

Summary:

One of my objections is with regard to traffic. This proposed quarry is on my route to work and of of course going to affect my journey, also the condition of the road caused by heavy vehicles using it lay alone the noise and pollution to the area. Plus more disruption! bad when there are shows on on at the show ground.

[More details about Rep ID: 25393](#)

Representation ID: [25375](#)

**OBJECT** Malcolm W Humphries

Summary:

I object to the proposed sand and gravel quarry so close to Newark because:

The major health risk of micro fine dust, of silica and other materials. An inevitable part of such a quarries working processes

All within 2 miles of the town center and Newark's 30,000 plus residents.

All which lie directly in the path of summer winds, blowing from the proposed site position

The first of the schools and senior citizens homes 0.5 miles and 1 mile from beacon hill.

Other impacts - traffic congestion/ noise/ light pollution

[More details about Rep ID: 25375](#)

Representation ID: [25299](#)

**OBJECT** Friederike Mallchok and 1 other

Summary:

Noise. Dust. Traffic. Environment and health. Future planning.

[More details about Rep ID: 25299](#)

Representation ID: [25284](#)

**OBJECT** Premji Patel

Summary:

Property prices. Coddington is a peaceful village for which we paid a premium to live here; is the visual/noise/dust impacts of a quarry the value of our homes will be affected. If the quarry is used as landfill then the prices will be affected further still

Change To Plan:

Refuse planning permission.

[More details about Rep ID: 25284](#)

Representation ID: [25282](#)

**OBJECT** Premji Patel

Summary:

Dust/silica issues to health, trees, homes and car as its carried by the air movement.

Change To Plan:

Ideallt refused permission. Central plant to be site further away and training grounds, weather to be taken into account when monitoring the dust onsite and at remote distance say Coddington community centre. Is the dust nuisance and for tha matter noise too going to be policed by independant body?

[More details about Rep ID: 25282](#)

Representation ID: [25281](#)

**OBJECT** Premji Patel

Summary:

Groundwater seeping away due to quarry. I know that if a quarry is dug the residual water in the ground will be affected, concerns are the impact of this to Coddington and to Stapleford Woods.

Change To Plan:

Ideally permission refused.

[More details about Rep ID: 25281](#)

Representation ID: [25279](#)

**OBJECT** Premji Patel

Summary:

Noise disturbance to sleep patterns.

Change To Plan:

Ideally planning permission being refused bearing in mind other concerns submitted. In this specific case how much noise will be generated, will curfew be dictated zero noise at weekends and from 8pm to 7am?

[More details about Rep ID: 25279](#)

Representation ID: [25035](#)

**OBJECT** John Lomax and 1 other

Summary:

We wish to express our outrage at the proposed site.

1. The A1/A46/A17 junction is, according to your own transport department, at saturation point, further worsened by Curry's distribution centre expansion. Only major central government investment can improve this situation. To further increase demand is to say at least foolhardy and ill-conceived; there are an ever growing occurrences of major accidents. Gridlock is growing ever more common, a major future potential problem with no alternative route from your proposed site.

2. The impact on health from prevailing winds has not been given consideration. Dust and micro particles will spread over Coddington and south west Newark including four primary schools (over 5,000 children to be affected over life of site). Published reports highlight the potential risks to health and Robert Jenrick's appointment to health select committee should now mean the closest scrutiny for this area.

Change To Plan:

We limit our comment to two specific areas. Had these received your detailed consideration at the appropriate time you would undoubtedly have drawn different conclusions in your Minerals Local Plan. It seems to us that the specific points we have raised are themselves ground to look for a full public enquiry if your Local Mineral Plan is not amended to withdraw the proposal in relation to Coddington.

[More details about Rep ID: 25035](#)

Representation ID: [25033](#)

**OBJECT** Miss J Smith

Summary:

I object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Noise from large vehicles and machinery working all day will severely taint the natural area
- Dust would aggravate existing health conditions and such people will not be able to sit outside and enjoy their gardens or the fresh air. Also bad for those using the area for leisure/sporting activities.
- Increase in HGVs and staff vehicles causing disruption and noise and making local roads unsafe.
- Environmental impact on Stapleford Woods and its native species and diverse ecology. Change to water table adversely affecting trees, plants and wildlife.

- Loss of agricultural land

- Future potential of the site to be turned into a landfill

- Existing sites should be extended first

- Destruction of the local landscape and peaceful environment

Change To Plan:

Please reconsider this proposal

[More details about Rep ID: 25033](#)

Representation ID: [25032](#)

**OBJECT** Trudi Ward-Walters

Summary:

As a Coddington homeowner, a Winthorpe & Coddington Tigers parent and committee member I strongly object to the proposed quarry on the A17 at Coddington. I am concerned about HGVs on local roads, risk to house prices and eyesore and dust. As an asthma sufferer I am concerned for my health and the health and safety of others

Why are you unable to find a location that is not so close to a residential area.

[More details about Rep ID: 25032](#)

Representation ID: [24940](#)

**OBJECT** Bob Young

Summary:

I object because:

Our village football field is situated on the south east corner of this proposal; this will have a huge effect on this sport. Noise, dust and sand will be blown over the pitches as the prevailing winds are from the west.

I spent the vast majority of my football career at Coddington Tigers playing field and it has developed me physically and mentally. By building this quarry close to a public playing field you will be endangering or even depriving the future children the chance to play football.

Under no way do I agree with your plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24940](#)

Representation ID: [24921](#)

**OBJECT** Newark Golf Club (David Collingwood)

Summary:

Writing on behalf of Newark Golf Club. Writing to express our unanimous concerns over the Coddington proposal because of the following:

High levels of existing traffic on the A17 making access to the golf club difficult. Further HGVs on this route are likely to increase these problems further.

We fear that the continuous noise from working machinery will impact on the current quiet setting and a permanent fine dust being blown towards the golf club will be a health hazard.

[More details about Rep ID: 24921](#)

Representation ID: [24886](#)

**OBJECT** Coddington Tenants and Residents Association represented by Miss Diana Jones

Summary:

The Coddington Tenants and Residents Association objects to the proposal to extract sand and gravel on the edge of the village.

This would have negative effects on the village environment, with greatly increased traffic, road safety issues, noise and dust pollution, environmental damage and loss of agricultural land.

The people of Coddington do not want this quarry.

[More details about Rep ID: 24886](#)

Representation ID: [24843](#)

**OBJECT** PN Bryan and 1 other

Summary:

Proposed quarry site is too close to Coddington village, Coddington Football Club and Stapleford Woods. The Football Club provides amenities for players 7 years old through to senior football. Dust could have serious consequences for player's health. Stapleford Woods is home to a wide selection of wildlife, including deer. Noise and dust could affect financial viability/amenity of Newark Air Museum and Newark Showground. The village will also suffer the effects of noise and dust and increased traffic. Overall environmental effect from the quarry and increased greenhouse emissions from traffic are not acceptable.

[More details about Rep ID: 24843](#)

Representation ID: [24819](#)

**OBJECT** Lindsey J Lynch

Summary:

I would like to raise the following objections:

Loss of farmland and the effect on the environment to wildlife, trees and surrounding woodland.

The amount of dust both seen and unseen. Impact on those with asthma and lung disease.

Increase in HGV movements along the A17 and surrounding routes.

Drop in house prices and difficulties in selling property.

Effects on local amenities; Showground, air museum and Stapleford woods

When a quarry like this is allowed to happen it then makes it easier for the same thing to happen around Coddington and other parts of the country.

[More details about Rep ID: 24819](#)

Representation ID: [24806](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Steven Hanstock

Summary:

Noise and dust pollution. Increase in traffic.

[More details about Rep ID: 24806](#)

Representation ID: [24803](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Alan Marsden

Summary:

Noise pollution. Visual impact of the site. Dust pollution. Plant positioning.

[More details about Rep ID: 24803](#)

Representation ID: [24801](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Ray Edwards

Summary:

Road safety. Rural economy. The environment. Local archaeology. The local community.  
Wrong development in the wrong place.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington site from the Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24801](#)

Representation ID: [24800](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Steve Scott

Summary:

Air quality pollution.

[More details about Rep ID: 24800](#)

Representation ID: [24799](#)

**OBJECT** Michael Keyworth

Summary:

Noise pollution. Increase in traffic. Effect on health.

[More details about Rep ID: 24799](#)

Representation ID: [24797](#)

**OBJECT** CM Eagger

Summary:

Local road network is already at capacity due to proximity to Newark, A1 and A46. The showground also creates large amounts of traffic in the local area.

The A17 should be widened before this development takes place.

The proposed site is also of historical importance and draws many people from far and wide.

All these things should be taken into account.

[More details about Rep ID: 24797](#)

Representation ID: [24770](#)

**OBJECT** Clare Pennington

Summary:

Increase in traffic, dust and noise pollution.

[More details about Rep ID: 24770](#)

Representation ID: [24762](#)

**OBJECT** Miss Diana Jones

Summary:

Unacceptable traffic and road safety problems and noise and dust pollution.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington site from the Plan

[More details about Rep ID: 24762](#)

Representation ID: [24739](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs P Garner and 1 other

Summary:

Traffic congestion. Highway safety issues. Dust and noise pollution. Visual impact. Detrimental impact on the rural environment and conservation area. Negative impact on tourism. Potential for future exploitation and landfill site extension. Negative impact on the desirability of the village. Proximity to the village.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington from the Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24739](#)

Representation ID: [24735](#)

**OBJECT** Tony Peck and 1 other

Summary:

Strongly object to the proposal of the development of a massive quarry at Coddington. County Council already state there will be a huge negative impact on the surrounding areas should this development go ahead.

Points we feel should be taken into account:

Serious concern of the populations health due to silica dust

Impact of more HGV traffic on A17 adjoining the A46/A1 junction, which already backs up at peak times.

Long term impact on the environment over the next 30 years. Noise throughout week and plant maintenance at weekends

After 30 years is this to be considered a contaminated site?

[More details about Rep ID: 24735](#)

Representation ID: [24732](#)

**OBJECT** Mr John Beirne

Summary:

Pollution: asthma

Noise: Vehicles and quarry working

Death: Road traffic accidents

[More details about Rep ID: 24732](#)

Representation ID: [24731](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Fred Reed

Summary:

Unacceptbale levels of dust. Proposed entrance/exit should be on south/west corner of the site in order to reduce noise, dust and traffic congestion.

[More details about Rep ID: 24731](#)

Representation ID: [24730](#)

**OBJECT** Anne Adams

Summary:

Impinges on local activities eg walkers, bird watchers and football players

Road too narrow for HGVs to negotiate safely

Noise, pollution, damage to wildlife + woodland

The local community should be considered, with regard to house prices and quality of life.

[More details about Rep ID: 24730](#)

Representation ID: [24711](#)

**OBJECT** Cllr Maureen Dobson

Summary:

Proposal is premature in nature and has not fully considered the second and third order consequences in terms of the impacts and hazards on local traffic and wider transport infrastructure. For example Kelham bridge is already crumbling under the current strain. Looking at minerals extraction from a narrow view point of 'piecemeal development' without considering wider area is not a recipe for success.

The plan should have a more holistic review of the transport and infrastructure in the area. A masterplan should be developed looking at the impacts on the A1,A46,A17 and A1133 with a wide range of organisations.

Change To Plan:

The site should be withdraw from this plan until a solution to the highway infrastructure can be found for all.

[More details about Rep ID: 24711](#)

Representation ID: [24697](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Jonathan Garner and 1 other

Summary:

We object for the following reasons:

- Existing traffic congestion on the A17.
- Quarry traffic should not be allowed through the village
- More suitable sites to the north and west of Newark served by better road infrastructure
- Highway safety issues from extra HGVs and mud on the road
- Noise pollution from 24 hour working
- Visual impact from industrial looking quarry and the significant lighting required
- Detrimental impact upon the rural environment and neighboring conservation area
- Destruction of historic environment
- Negative impact on tourism
- Potential for future exploitation and landfill site
- Negative impact on desirability of village
- Proximity to village

[More details about Rep ID: 24697](#)

Representation ID: [24693](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Nora Reed

Summary:

Two main recreational area which will be destroyed by this proposal:

- Stapleford woods which will die due to lowering of the water table
- Coddington and Winthorpe tigers football club.

Proposal to build the entrance/exit + all extraction machinery, loading facilities, stock piles of raw material immediately adjoining the site will mean unacceptable noise, dust and fine dust into lungs of football players.

Access to the site should be located on the north west corner on to the A46 with plant site further from village.

Do not believe local highway can cope with further HGVs.

[More details about Rep ID: 24693](#)

Representation ID: [24690](#)

**OBJECT** Mr P Waller

Summary:

I object because:

- The only transport means for this site is by road which will increase pressure on road network especially Balderton Lane and Drove Lane
- Extra noise and dust pollution will be detrimental to wildlife, woodland and quality of life.
- Prospect of house price decline
- Lack of capacity on A17 for extra HGVs
- Further extensions to the quarry in the future if permission granted

Surely better sites closer to markets and more suitable transport methods such as barge saving lorry miles and CO2

Numerous other reasons but you have the main gist.

[More details about Rep ID: 24690](#)

Representation ID: [24682](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Goodall and 1 other

Summary:

I wish to object because:

Noise: We can hear loud speakers from the showground just over a mile away. With proposed quarry under 1 mile away there is going to be constant noise from HGVs as well as reversing beepers from lorries and loading tractors. As well as constant rumbling from the grading equipment.

Historical

The proposed site covers a significant number of medieval fields and pastures, and is close to Coddington Moor which was involved in a civil war battle. With the Newark Civil war center opening soon, we cannot afford to lose a site of such historical significance.

[More details about Rep ID: 24682](#)

Representation ID: [24679](#)

**OBJECT** Louise Price

Summary:

I strongly believe that this development is completely unsuitable for the location, and is too close to residential areas, schools & football field. It places too great a strain on already overloaded infrastructure. Noise, pollution, air quality and road safety issues will undoubtedly result.

increased heavy traffic on A17, making access to Winthorpe, air museum, showground and rural bike rides more difficult and dangerous over a prolonged period.

Forcing traffic onto the C208 disrupting the village

Noise, Dust

Damage to wildlife, tress and woodland. Experience in the area suggests this will be foothold for further exploration and possible landfill operations

[More details about Rep ID: 24679](#)

Representation ID: [24678](#)

**OBJECT** Philip Niclasen

Summary:

I am writing to object to the Coddington proposal on the following:

Traffic (including noise and impact on the local highway network))

Health and wellbeing (including noise and dust)

House prices

Environment and wildlife

Loss of agricultural land

Impact on village and local amenities.

I am opposed to the sighting of a quarry such close proximity to Coddington village

[More details about Rep ID: 24678](#)

Representation ID: [24662](#)

**OBJECT** Elizabeth Evans

Summary:

Very concerned to see the proposal to build a huge sand and gravel quarry next to the football field. There will be a huge impact on this facility - Noise,dust and sand will be blown over the pitches as the winds are from the West. Does the proposal include building a new football field?

The road infrastructure in the area is at capacity and will not be able to cope with the extra HGV movements.

Majority of sand and gravel is required around Nottingham, so sites closer to Nottingham should be developed to reduce HGV movements.

[More details about Rep ID: 24662](#)

Representation ID: [24653](#)

**OBJECT** Nerissa McDonald

Summary:

I objection because of the following:

- Increase in traffic on the already busy A17
- Negative impact on health and wellbeing from noise and dust
- Visual impact of the quarry
- Negative impact on house prices
- Impact on Stapleford woods
- Loss of agricultural land
- Damage to wildlife
- Impact on local amenities - air museum, Newark showground
- Impact on residents and amenities in the village

Like many other residents of what we hope to be a quiet and safe village for children and the elderly in particular, we stongly oppose and Quarry in the area.

[More details about Rep ID: 24653](#)

Representation ID: [24647](#)

**OBJECT** Nicola Wharam-Lewis

Summary:

I am writing to object about the proposed quarry on the grounds of:

- Negative health impacts from dust
- Noise pollution from the extraction of the mineral
- Road congestion/increase in road traffic accidents
- Negative environmental impacts including the effects of water drainage on Stapleford woods.
- Loss of agricultural land
- Future developments
- Adverse effects on house prices and enjoyment of property/ community.

[More details about Rep ID: 24647](#)

Representation ID: [24646](#)

**OBJECT** Robert Reed

Summary:

The development is completely unsuitable for the location because of:

- Proximity of other existing sand and gravel quarries in the area (Norton Disney)
- Noise and dust
- Impact on landscape and views on woods
- Local transport infrastructure is not sufficient to handle extra HGVs

- More suitable quarries closer to the main market of Nottingham
- Impact to the environment in the areas and in turn the affect on the value of my property.

Change To Plan:

If the site is approved it should be surrounded by trees to block the view and some of the noise and air pollution and returned back to viable agricultural land once completed.

[More details about Rep ID: 24646](#)

Representation ID: [24643](#)

**OBJECT** Philip Henson

Summary:

Coddington is a vibrant village with primary school, community center, home for the elderly, two pubs and a post office. Clear evidence that proposal will effect the village in the following ways:

- Dust impacting on health
- Noise and vibration
- Disturbance from HGV traffic
- Risk of accidents
- Hazardous materials on site
- Water and drainage issues
- Fire and explosion
- Impact on immediate habitat
- Loss of 300 hectares of agricultural land
- Human rights violations

Common sense approach appraisal of the facts will conclude that whilst sand and gravel extraction is required for economic growth it should not be allowed so close to Coddington

[More details about Rep ID: 24643](#)

Representation ID: [24639](#)

**OBJECT** Mr D Melrose

Summary:

I accept that sand and gravel are needed. I suspect that other areas would be more suitable. My main areas of concern for this site are:-

Health - Micron sized sized particles create health problems

Noise - in particular the grading of product

Infrastructure - The A17 and its junction with the A46/A1 (which is already not fit for purpose) would need to be vastly improved

Sites should not be near heavily populated areas

If this site is referred on to the next stage, I can expand on the above and look more closely at the situation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24639](#)

Representation ID: [24638](#)

**OBJECT** Mike Ayres

Summary:

I object because:

Excessive traffic on roads that often are already blocked due to accidents on the A1,A46,A17 - makes cycling to and from the woods even more treacherous

The number of extra vehicles will only make the main road through Coddington even worse

Risk of pollution/dust to local residents

Damage to Stapleford woods which we often walk or bike through

Risk to the local wildlife

Noise pollution is already an issue from the A1 we do not need to add to it

Issues affecting the local football pitches/ under 12s football team

Change To Plan:

Please assess other mineral extraction sites before focusing on Coddington, clearly the site is not conducive to the extra traffic, noise and dust pollution and damage to valued local nature walks.

[More details about Rep ID: 24638](#)

Representation ID: [24634](#)

**OBJECT** John Dickinson and 1 other

Summary:

My wife and I strongly appose the opening of the proposed quarry in Coddington because it is too close to where we live and we are concerned that the noise, dust and traffic will gravely disturb the peace and seriously pollute the atmosphere of our home.

[More details about Rep ID: 24634](#)

Representation ID: [24626](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Anthony Richardson and 1 other

Summary:

I object because:

My husband has a serious chest and breathing problem and can do without the extra dust in his life.

Our house will be devalued by the quarry.

If quarry is granted planning permission we should get a reduction in our council tax.

Sick of not having peace up here for years to come. Would the planners like to live in this situation they created?

New housing estates putting pressure on old drainage systems causing flooding.

This was a lovely area in 1979 but we hate it now nothing but stress and misery.

A17 already at capacity.

[More details about Rep ID: 24626](#)

Representation ID: [24625](#)

**OBJECT** Miss Ellie Moor

Summary:

I do not agree with the proposed site as I live near Coddington and the lovely village is being spoilt. The surroundings are one of the reasons we live here. The added houses and that disruption are bad enough, but adding a quarry nearby would decrease my houses value and make it dirty and unpleasant. Not a nice, friendly, beautiful, safe place to raise children. Do not build this quarry please.

[More details about Rep ID: 24625](#)

Representation ID: [24624](#)

**OBJECT** Sandra Stafford

Summary:

I object because:

The A17 cannot cope with more HGV traffic

Loosing more prime agricultural land to houses and roads. Sand and gravel only needed in construction of housing/ roads so just creating vicious circle.

Time to stop building any more. Therefore, no need for any further quarrying in this area.

Time to save what little countryside we have left in this area. Please for our grand childrens sake.

Once quarried it will be deemed unfit for agriculture so we are left with pits to fill with rubbish or more solar farms. We should Grow our own food.

[More details about Rep ID: 24624](#)

Representation ID: [24596](#)

**OBJECT** John Keeble

Summary:

The constant and substantiated tort of injunctions

Inadequate infrastructure to cope

The rat run that will inevitably be used by drivers is by a primary school

Is there sufficient minerals to support the massive enabling expenditure, or will it be another tax payers burden

The A17/A46/A1 junction is not safe now and will become more dangerous for users. (locals already try and avoid junction, visitors not familiar with the layout and high speed approach will increase accident and death rates)

No one wants this quarry so close to their homes

Explosives will increase the risk to the community from terrorists

Change To Plan:

Lafarge have a minerals quarry already up and running near South Collingham on the A1133, opposite Whitemoor Lane. This has the benefits of being alongside the River Trent and the NOB1 railway lane to the East Coast Main line and for the quantity of minerals, this site is ideal, has planning consent and easy connection availability for freight removal.

The site also has the benefits of being established and the farmer will jump at the chance of selling land.

[More details about Rep ID: 24596](#)

Representation ID: [24595](#)

SUPPORT Mrs Judith Hamdani

Summary:

It would be an underestimation to say I am devastated by the proposed Notts County Council Minerals Plan for sand and gravel extraction in the Coddington area. The volume of noise and air pollution which will hit us, particularly during the important summer months, would be intolerable. A further concern is the volume traffic. Traffic can be a nightmare even now. There are many elderly residents living in the area, for them particularly, to endure the noise levels and air pollution if this project goes ahead, would be grossly abhorrent in today's caring society.

[More details about Rep ID: 24595](#)

Representation ID: [24592](#)

**OBJECT** Mary Danski

Summary:

Total objection to extraction of minerals in the Coddington area. The disruption to surrounding areas will be massive. Heavy vehicles transporting the minerals will increase affecting many roads in Coddington. Amenities we now enjoy, primarily Stapelford Woods, will be affected by dust, lorries toing and froing, disrupting wildlife. Also the Showground and Air Museum with increase in traffic on the already busy Winthorpe Roundabout. This will not be a short term operation but will be ongoing for many years to come. I urge that this proposal is squashed.

[More details about Rep ID: 24592](#)

Representation ID: [24586](#)

**OBJECT** Alan Phillips and 1 other

Summary:

Object to proposed quarrying at Coddington/Stapelford Woods. We have a clear view of the proposed area. Development of this site would cause dust to be blown over our property preventing us from enjoying our garden. We already hear noise from Newark showground but quarrying noise would be continuous throughout day. 180 additional lorries per day on A17 would be too much on this already busy road and could cause serious problems at A1/A46/A17 junction. This could cause lorries to use local roads which have weight restrictions, are narrow and unsuitable for 20+ tonne lorries. Light pollution from site lighting.

[More details about Rep ID: 24586](#)

Representation ID: [24574](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Lesley Walker

Summary:

By developing a 300 acre quarry at Coddington to abstract half a million tonnes of sand and gravel a year, the whole area will be adversely affected - by noise, dust, overuse of roads by HGVs and the destruction of the countryside. This development should be stopped.

[More details about Rep ID: 24574](#)

Representation ID: [24571](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Gwenneth Clarke

Summary:

I object to the proposed quarry because:

Loss of quality farm land and disruption to wildlife especially deer and possible damage to woodland.

HGV movement on the A17 could make crossing a busy junction from Drove lane more precarious to get to showground, air museum and doctors at Collingham.

Isn't it time we found alternatives to sand and gravel or is it just the easy option?

Nottinghamshire has provided enough of this stuff. Its done its duty, its time to stop.

Wrong place, badly sighted.

[More details about Rep ID: 24571](#)

Representation ID: [24565](#)

**OBJECT** Marilyn A Harrison

Summary:

I object to the Coddington quarry proposal for the following reasons:

Air pollution in the form dust will affect the health of local residents.

Noise pollution will be a major ever present problems from extraction and HGVs

Increased HGV traffic on already very busy roads will create congestion problems on the A17.

Potential increase in accidents and Newark hospital only deals with minor trauma cases

Potential for site to be extended in the future

Loss of quality farm land and destruction of wildlife, trees and woodland

Adverse impact on stapleford woods, the aircraft museum and the Showground

Lack of information regarding need for on site machinery maintenance or if concrete batching plant on site.

Coddington village will die if the quarry goes ahead.

[More details about Rep ID: 24565](#)

Representation ID: [24563](#)

**OBJECT** BG Wright

Summary:

As a food producer I strongly object to the proposal to destroy 300 acres of productive land for the quarry at Coddington.

In less than 40 yrs we will be under food rationing in this country, we have dropped from 70% self-sufficiency to 60% in 10 years, and may be unable to import because of cost or

scarcity.

World food supply is on a Knife edge, and 2/3rds of the world are hungry. To turn Coddington into the same dereliction as Langford quarry would be nothing short of criminal. If aggregate is needed, we should be crushing rock as other countries do, and of which Britain has an abundance. Also as a land-owner concerned, it would have been nice to have been informed officially.

[More details about Rep ID: 24563](#)

Representation ID: [24541](#)

**OBJECT** Brian Cook and 1 other

Summary:

We wish to protest with regard to the planned massive quarry planned for Coddington.

Consider:-

- A) 180 extra heavy lorry movements a day driving onto and along the A17 to distant customers in South Yorkshire and Nottingham.
- B) Disruption from the quarry for at least 20 years
- C) Noise, dust and lower house prices for everyone nearby
- D) Loss of quality farm land and damage to wildlife, trees and woodland
- E) Effects on the amenities of the air museum, Stapleford woods and showground.
- F) More areas around the village ripe for exploitation as quarries

[More details about Rep ID: 24541](#)

Representation ID: [24511](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Rex Boaler

Summary:

My objections are:

A significant reduction in air quality, which will be hazardous to health as dust from the site will be carried over a wide area.

We already suffer the effects of the Sugar Factory and the Sewerage Works which are sited on the other side of Newark. This site will be a lot closer.

The A1/A46/A17 roundabout is already seriously overloaded, any additional traffic, (which won't just be 180 lorries, it will also be the workers and support services attending the site), will hugely increase the congestion, which will result in traffic seeking alternative routes through the nearby villages.

Change To Plan:

The site should not be entertained, an alternative location should be found well away from residential areas where it will not cause serious congestion and a hazard to health and the environment.

[More details about Rep ID: 24511](#)

Representation ID: [24502](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Concern about effects of MP2o on mental & physical health of residents (for 20 years, many within 400m of site): Direct health effects especially on children, elderly, those with health problems. Psychosomatic effects: lowered disease resistance, depression. Our peaceful homes & gardens (formerly a safe refuge) are now besieged by things beyond our control. We worry about the future e.g. more extraction, or restoration by waste landfill (Cotham's dire fate?). For vulnerable or isolated people under pressure, perhaps feeling trapped here financially (tenants can't be relocated or owner occupiers sell their houses), increase cases of depression is very likely.

Change To Plan:

The MLP should take proper account of the National Planning Policy Framework:

- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason, and remove the Coddington site from the MLP.

[More details about Rep ID: 24502](#)

Representation ID: [24500](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

If site Coddington MP2o has to be worked it must be restored as mainly agricultural land and part restored open landscape. The landscape must be historically appropriate to the site e.g. acid grassland, moor, or marsh (not open water which is alien to the Parish). The landscape restoration should use the poorer land subject to flooding to the NE and bordering Stapleford Woods and Moor Brats. It should relate to Stapleford Woods amenity with public access routes be created to both sites from Drove Lane.

Change To Plan:

- 1.Site restoration plans for Coddington should be historically appropriate to the location, and not include open water which is alien to the Parish.
2. NSDC must work with Coddington Parish Council to ensure all suitable trees have TPOs.

[More details about Rep ID: 24500](#)

Representation ID: [24499](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The Sustainability matrix scores Coddington MP2o as -2 ('negative') both during and after operations on Objective 8 (protect soil/best agricultural land), admitting that high quality land will probably be irretrievably lost. The MP2o allocation, most of which is Grade 2 and 3a ('Best and most versatile land'), represents a large part of Coddington's agricultural land North of Beckingham Road. There are two farms here - where will they find replacement land to farm close to their buildings? Britain needs agricultural land to feed a growing population - mineral working is destroying it, and replacing it with lagoons is unsustainable.

Change To Plan:

- 1 The allocation MP2o should be refused.
- 2 If the allocation is worked the Site Development Brief should insist on the 'Best and most versatile land' being restored to high quality agricultural land.
- 3 Stand-offs should be assigned to allow enough top-soil to be banked, in

addition to the corridors on which the immovable 400 kV transmission line and other infrastructure sits. 4 Further stand-offs will be required to protect trees (along the extensive wooded boundary in the NE, plus Stapleford Woods and Moor Brats) and on which tree-screening and banking should be established (trees at least 5 years before site construction and extraction starts) to protect residents and local businesses.

[More details about Rep ID: 24499](#)

Representation ID: [24498](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

Sustainability Objective 11: Air Quality. Traffic Congestion on roads around Newark will be significantly worsened by having 70% of Notts sand & gravel extraction concentrated there. Not only tempers and safety will suffer - slow moving traffic will contribute more pollution (CO2 and PM10 particulates) impacting on local air quality. This is in addition to the direct pollution from HGVs carrying sand/gravel. The latest figures from the Minerals Products Association show the average HGV vehicle size of 20 tonnes, and average delivery distances of 43km. Newark area is proposed to serve South Yorkshire markets, Sheffield is 72km, Hull 100km away

Change To Plan:

The strategy of c70% of Notts gravel production in the Newark area is flawed and should be rejected as unsustainable and logistically undeliverable.

[More details about Rep ID: 24498](#)

Representation ID: [24497](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The Sustainability matrix for Coddington MP2o (PA10) is overoptimistic in favour of development. Objective 11 (protect/improve local air quality) scores -1. Twenty year working (plus restoration) with large quantities processed (9.5M Tonnes) will create a lot of dust across the whole village and nearby leisure businesses - experience from other sites shows it cannot be eliminated. Many adults will experience it for their lifetime and children will be born and raised in it. 180 HGV movements/day contribute a lot of pollution - especially worrying for closest residents, the football pitch & children's playground - plus walkers, cyclists & horse riders.

Change To Plan:

1 Coddington MP2o Sustainability score against Objective 11 should be scored as -2 (likely to be negative) or -3 (likely to be very negative) and the revised results included in MLP documents.

2 The site should be removed from the MLP consultation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24497](#)

Representation ID: [24496](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The Sustainability matrix justifying the selection of Coddington MP2o (PA10) is overoptimistic in favour of development and it should be reassessed. Objective 3 (promote sustainable transport) is scored +1 during operation. How can a site near Newark serving distant Nottingham and Yorkshire for 20 years entirely by HGV (pumping out CO2/PM10 particulates & damaging already heavily-congested roads) be described as even slightly sustainable! The site may be physically close to the A1 and A46 but access onto the single-carriageway A17 has issues and all Newark intersections A17-A1-A46 are already in congestion-safety crisis according to the Highways Agency.

Change To Plan:

1 Coddington MP2o Sustainability score against Objective 7 should be scored as -2 (likely to be negative) and the revised results included in MLP documents.

2 The site should be removed from the MLP consultation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24496](#)

Representation ID: [24495](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The Sustainability matrix justifying the selection of Coddington MP2o (PA10) is overoptimistic in favour of development and should be reassessed. Both Sustainability Assessments (Oct 13 and May 14) state it is an iterative and subjective process. Objective 1 (contributes to demand) and 13 (support economic development) both score +3 because it's a massive site of 20 years duration. There is no duration weighting for negative impacts on 4 and 5 (protect historic environment & quality of landscape - spoiling the landscape & conservation area setting for a long time), 11 and 14 (protect air quality and human health/quality of life).

Change To Plan:

1 The projected lifetimes, end dates, and total tonnages for full durations (not curtailed to the end of the plan period) should be included in the table for all sites.

2 Coddington MP2o Sustainability matrix should be reassessed across all 14 objectives, recognising the duration weighting for negative impacts, and the revised results included in MLP documents.

3 The site should be removed from the MLP consultation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24495](#)

Representation ID: [24493](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Hanson states '... Hanson would carry out full consultation with the local community, statutory bodies and other interested parties to develop a scheme with long term benefits to nature and the local community.' Coddington, with no experience of mining or extraction, is understandably extremely worried at the prospect of a 20 year, 300 acre pit just 300 metres from its village envelope. If Hanson are serious they would agree to a village meeting, explaining the nature of their process, how the site operation would affect us, and how they minimise that impact to keep our community safe and healthy.

Change To Plan:

NCC to arrange a public consultation meeting at Coddington with the developer, prior to development of the Submission document.

[More details about Rep ID: 24493](#)

Representation ID: [24486](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Insley

Summary:

I totally oppose the proposed Quarry at Coddington:

Devastation to the local Environment/ biodiversity including issues like noise, air quality, loss of wildlife, trees, ancient woodland.

Higher risks of flooding

Public Health will suffer from poor air quality, excessive dust/dirt. No research report submitted re long term health issues.

Detrimental health impact on local children at Coddington Primary School

Newark a hotspot for traffic gridlock, 180 extra heavy lorry will make Newark impassable affecting businesses/ tourism.

Poor quality road infrastructure around the site will deteriorate with the use of heavy industrial Lorries.

Site will be a blot on the landscape.

Change To Plan:

Remove Site MP2o from the plan as there are more suitable areas to develop.

Carry out full assessment on the health impacts to local residents in relation to the position of the site.

Consider People and wildlife before profit!

[More details about Rep ID: 24486](#)

Representation ID: [24482](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The proposed quarry at Coddington is causing great concern particularly for houses and amenities closest to the site boundaries due to worries about the adverse health and quality of life impacts from noise during construction and operation of the quarry. The NPPF covers noise, and in particular planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

This point emphasises why there are such concerns about quarry noise on the tranquil setting of the village.

Change To Plan:

NCC should specify what noise monitoring, abatement, and noise limits are required prior to any planning application being made, and identify the noise management plans the operator will be required to implement to reduce the impact from construction, operation, restoration, and transport noise on the neighbourhood.

[More details about Rep ID: 24482](#)

Representation ID: [24478](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Terence Whitburn

Summary:

Effect of the extraction of sand & gravel on the local water table. The local ground water will be initially drain into the pit, reducing the local water table after this water run off will increase the level of water in the pit producing seepage of ground water down slope towards Stapleford wood, pump out to prevent this will result in surplus water being disposed of in local drainage ditches. Surface water from heavy rain will add to this problem

Change To Plan:

pump out water will have to be filtered to remove excess sediment. seepage water I do not know a solution. Reject this proposal

[More details about Rep ID: 24478](#)

Representation ID: [24477](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Andrew Palin

Summary:

I object on the grounds of increased air and noise pollution, and a significant increase in heavy traffic on already congested roads (with associated noise and safety concerns).

General quality of life will change for the worse.

Change To Plan:

The proposed plans should be cancelled and other alternatives sought.

[More details about Rep ID: 24477](#)

Representation ID: [24476](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Terence Whitburn

Summary:

The village of Coddington will be subjected to dust pollution from this site in North to North East winds. As will Stapleford wood from westerly winds. Plus the pickup of dust spread along the A17 by the gravel lorry's ,all thou these will be covered the dust accumulation on the lorry bodywork and tyre's will come off along the road. air draft from passing traffic will lift this into the air allowing wind to distribute it in all directions

Change To Plan:

there is no complete solution to this water damping and washing down of lorry's will only reduce this. Complete solution reject this proposal

[More details about Rep ID: 24476](#)

Representation ID: [24472](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The proposed new sand and gravel quarry at Coddington is causing great concern among residents and amenities closest to the site boundaries due to worries about the health impacts of dust emissions. The concerns are about total particulate matter, but also on the

more risky PM10 and PM2.5 particle size ranges. The consultation documents does not cover how air quality will be modelled and assessed prior to any site development, nor what air quality monitoring and management plans will be in place during operation. Air quality modelling may be vital when positioning the processing plant away the perimeter.

Change To Plan:

NCC should specify what air quality modelling and assessment is required prior to any planning application being made, and identify the management plans the operator will be require to implement to reduce fugitive emissions, including cumulative levels, to internationally acceptable levels.

[More details about Rep ID: 24472](#)

Representation ID: [24462](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The new Sustainability Assessment gives a more extensive analysis and discussion to 6 sites (new & those challenged in 2013) than was afforded the 26 sites in the original Sustainability Assessment. The new document contains Sustainability matrices and maps for all sites (but the different scales give false impressions of relative site sizes and distances from buildings). There is no table comparing scores for all the sites across each of the 14 Sustainability objectives. The site comparison table (with Sustainability scores: operational period, long term, overall) is not in the main consultation document, but in the revised site selection document.

Change To Plan:

- 1 All the sites in the consultation should have been given equal attention and discussion in the revised document. The public needs to be reassured that the old and new assessments are comparable.
- 2 The Sustainability site comparison table should be in the main consultation document.
- 3 The map scaling factors should be made consistent (and a text searchable title to the map included on the page).

[More details about Rep ID: 24462](#)

Representation ID: [24437](#)

**OBJECT** Miss JA Piper

Summary:

Having been settled in Main Street, Coddington for a number of years it is my intention to stay here for the rest of my life. So the prospect of a gigantic quarry being opened up with a stone's throw of my home is horrifying. For all the reasons listed on the letter from the Parish Council, traffic, noise, dust, environmental impact, loss of agricultural land, would any sane person want this dumping on their doorstep for the rest of their life? The answer is a great big NO!!! Naturally the companies who will be lining their pockets from this won't be suffering from this unmitigated disaster now will they!

[More details about Rep ID: 24437](#)

Representation ID: [24416](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Janet O'Donnell O'Donnell

Summary:

The site is too close to the village; unacceptable intrusion into basic quality of life by noise and dust has not been given sufficient regard.

The assessed effect of increased heavy traffic from S&G sites has ignored impact of other future increased economic activity or more housing. Inadequate road systems are already under great daily stress, more so after traffic incidents. The district must have a broad infrastructure strategy to cope with all planned development even prior to additional S&G site openings in the area. There are already serious difficulties eg EMAS transit/transfer times to the major hospitals.

Change To Plan:

Remove Site MP2o from the Consultation.

Defer any possible S&G development until a broad and adequate, new infrastructure is in place to sustain the district's planned growth.

If proceeding, move the MP2o site's processing plant to the north-west corner. Delete planned use of the A17; provide instead sole site access/exit via a new/improved link to the A46/A1133 roundabout.

[More details about Rep ID: 24416](#)

Representation ID: [24405](#)

**OBJECT** Michael Bassey

Summary:

I have lived in Ordoyno Grove, Coddington for the past 14 years and enjoy the peace and calm of the neighbourhood. It is less than a mile from the proposed quarry site. I find it very disturbing to think that the County Council proposes to allow quarrying while stating that "surrounding settlements could be negatively affected by noise, dust and traffic". In a civilised society this should not be the case: Coddington has a population of over 1600 people - all living within a mile and a quarter of the site. This is not a case of nimbyism. No one should live as close as proposed here to a quarry exuding dust and noise.

Change To Plan:

I hope the Council will delete this site from the proposed plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 24405](#)

Representation ID: [24373](#)

**OBJECT** Mr MJ Farrell and 1 other

Summary:

We do not want lorries congestion on our roads, noise pollution or our health to be affected. Coddington Village will be devastated if this quarry goes ahead.

[More details about Rep ID: 24373](#)

Representation ID: [24338](#)

**OBJECT** Sarah Ridley

Summary:

As above

Change To Plan:

Ideally not approve sand and gravel mining in the Coddington area.

The plan and associated comments suggest that the current thinking is to turn the area (once mining is finished) into a wetland area - there should be firm assurance that this is so, and that once the area is degraded by mining a different view will not prevail (such as landfill)

If the plan cannot be withdrawn then the main site should be placed further from both the village of coddington, the A17 and from Stapleford Woods.

If the plan cannot be withdrawn exploraration should be made of access onto the A46 rather than the A17.

If the plan cannot be withdrawn robust measures be put in place to minimise disruption and pollution beyond the statutory minimum, and that there should be some mechanism during the lifetime of the mining operation to make sure that the measures can be improved if they are found to be insufficient.

[More details about Rep ID: 24338](#)

Representation ID: [24336](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Sue Stott

Summary:

Concerns about the noise and light pollution.

Health concerns as my son has astma and dust is a trigger.

Concerns for the safety of my children crossing the road to primary school as there will be more traffic.

Worried about our house price decreasing.

We moved to coddington to live, walk and cycle in the beautiful countryside and this site will change all of that.

I do not believe that the roads in and out of Newark can support the extra lorries. The A17 is already a death trap with many fatalities. Extra mud/debris on the road will add to the hazards.

Change To Plan:

Use another site which is more appropriate and won't make such a massive impact.

[More details about Rep ID: 24336](#)

Representation ID: [24318](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Against sustainability objective 4, Coddington MP2o, has been conveniently downgraded in the MLP Sustainability Assessment - the site has been artificially separated from its village context and Coddington Conservation Area by choosing the artificial barrier of the Newark

Bypass (A17 constructed in the late 1980s) as an assessment boundary for the historic environment. I believe the site deserves the same sustainability rating 'highest environmental sensitivity' afforded to the rest of the village given its medieval and civil war heritage.

Change To Plan:

1. Coddington should not be selected as a site, as it been scored more positively than is warranted.
2. The site heritage and sustainability ratings should be corrected in all the associated documents.

[More details about Rep ID: 24318](#)

Representation ID: [24317](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

I strongly object to the destruction of the site Coddington MP2o through quarrying, which has a high potential for archaeology, recognised by English Heritage. It was the site of an early English Civil War battle on 9th March 1642 and of a historic Annual Horse Race 'Coddington Races' documented from 1619 - 1877. With the newly refurbished Newark Museum focusing its scope on the 17thC (and hoping to become the Civil War tourism national destination of choice) the area cannot afford to lose yet another relevant site to quarrying.

Change To Plan:

The site heritage and sustainability ratings should be corrected in all the associated documents. The site should not be included in the MLP given the high negative sustainability score.

[More details about Rep ID: 24317](#)

Representation ID: [24316](#)

**OBJECT** Ms Sharon Toye

Summary:

The proposed quarry area will have negative impacts for local residents in terms of noise, dust, traffic, flood risk (potentially increasing insurance premiums) and also will detract from the haven generated by the nature reserve in Stapleford Woods. Prevailing winds mean that properties in Stapleford Lane will particularly suffer from increased/persistent noise and dust; this will negatively impact property values and reduce quality of living. Access to the woods for local cyclists and walkers, as well as to Coddington by Stapleford Lane residents, would also be impacted by busier traffic flows, increasing the risk of an accident.

Change To Plan:

The proposal for a new quarry site at Coddington should be refused.

[More details about Rep ID: 24316](#)

Representation ID: [24302](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Keith Fowkes and 1 other

Summary:

We object most strongly to the Coddington proposals. It would be a disaster for Coddington for the following reasons:

Detrimental the village in general:

Up to 180 lorries per day driving up to and along the A17;

In the near vicinity of the local school, village hall and residential areas of the village;

Noise and dust for a period of up to 20 years;

Environmental pollution and a negative impact on wildlife;

Not beneficial to the residents of Coddington or Newark:

Risk of flooding:

Destroying landscape and agricultural land:

Within the areas already earmarked for development along the Lincolnshire border:

[More details about Rep ID: 24302](#)

Representation ID: [24295](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Nigel English

Summary:

I am worried about the impact on the air quality decreasing down wind of the site.

Mainly due to dust and noise.

Has a full impact assessment been carried out, if so can it be published.

Change To Plan:

Carry out full assessment on the health impacts to local residents in relation to the position of the site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24295](#)

Representation ID: [24294](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Nigel English

Summary:

I am concerned about the additional traffic on the A17 in both the problems of the additional volume noise-wise and the impact on the already badly designed roundabouts at the A46 and the Know How industrial area.

Who will pay for the upkeep of this road as I understand it is not a highways adopted road.

The roundabouts at the A46 end and the Stapleford Woods end are already badly pitted due to heavy traffic.

Change To Plan:

Quarry somewhere else or if goes ahead move works and exit to A46 side of site.

Improve roundabouts. I understand they are already working at capacity and the A46 is in the higher end of the accident league tables.

[More details about Rep ID: 24294](#)

Representation ID: [24293](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Nigel English

Summary:

I am concerned about the noise from the proposed workings. Vehicles and machinery Noise from the A17 and the showground are a problem here already. This will make it worse  
Change To Plan:

Quarry somewhere else or if goes ahead move works away from this side of proposed area to the A46 end.

This would greatly improve the situation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24293](#)

Representation ID: [24292](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Leon LeBlanc

Summary:

The plan to extract minerals from the area is unsustainable from an environmental, social and economic point of view.

To go ahead with the plan would be a huge and entirely unnecessary own goal.

Change To Plan:

Extract the minerals from an area in the county where sustainability is far greater.

[More details about Rep ID: 24292](#)

Representation ID: [24220](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Terence Whitburn

Summary:

Increase in noise pollution Coddington lays between two very busy roads A1 & A17 this quarry will add considerably to the noise level , in extraction and road noise

Change To Plan:

reject the application for planning permission

[More details about Rep ID: 24220](#)

Representation ID: [24116](#)

**OBJECT** David C Hedge

Summary:

10 years ago, or thereabouts, a similar application was rejected on grounds that apply today only more so. These include air pollution, increased traffic, road damage and noise. The noise pollution and air pollution objections still hold good today.

The traffic in this area has increased considerably during this period and is a problem due to house building. Due to government demands the building of houses is set to increase considerably in the very near future.

Lorries have had weight carrying capacity increases and will cause more damage on the country roads in this area and around our local villages.

I cannot support extraction in this area and suggest another location be found that is not so heavily populated.

[More details about Rep ID: 24116](#)

Representation ID: [24103](#)

**OBJECT** Helen Dring

Summary:

I wish to voice my objections to the proposed quarry in Coddington.

Transportation of the sand and gravel will mean an extra 180 heavy lorries along the A17, which is already a very busy road. There will be disruption from the quarry for at least 20 years.

There will be extra noise and dust pollution in the area which will lower house prices for residents nearby.

There will be a loss of woodland, farmland and damage to wildlife.

The quarry will effect the amenities of the air museum, Stapleford Woods and Newark Showground.

Please consider my concerns before giving planning consent.

[More details about Rep ID: 24103](#)

Representation ID: [24099](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Adrian Parker

Summary:

180 extra heavy lorry movements a day

Road network already constrained at certain times

Quarry disruption for at least twenty

Environmental issues, noise, dust dirt, air quality, loss of wildlife, trees, woodland

Potential health issues (asthma increase etc)

Significant decrease in property prices and saleability

Aesthetics of the area.

Change To Plan:

The site needs to be rejected as being not suitable for the area

[More details about Rep ID: 24099](#)

Representation ID: [24055](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Isobel Turner

Summary:

The only means of transport from this site is by road, much of the minerals required are not for use in this area, sites nearer Nottingham are better placed.

There are currently no advantages for the village in this proposal either during or after the works. Drove Lane and Balderton Lane are already over-used as a rat run to Lincoln and the existing unprotected crossroads with the A17 is highly dangerous and the extra lorry traffic will only exacerbate the situation.

This plan would seem to severely affect the farm(s) concerned - occupying a significant portion of their land.

Change To Plan:

Find ways of giving some consolation to the affected area.

This could be by the addition of new rights of way - the village is fairly poorly served in this regard with no reasonable pedestrian access to Stapleford Woods and little in the way of circular walks. With some imagination this could be achieved during the life of the quarry as well as afterwards.

Also by obtaining public access to at least some of the area post-works (if it is not reinstated to farmland) - it would greatly enhance the wildlife potential of the adjacent Stapleford woods if it were extended.

[More details about Rep ID: 24055](#)

Representation ID: [24052](#)

**OBJECT** Mr JA Gray

Summary:

I strongly object to the proposed quarry at Coddington. As one of the nearest homes to this, the impact of noise, dust, and increased traffic will have a very detrimental effect on our quality of life. Moreover the value of our home will significantly fall being so close to this site.

We moved to this area because of the quality of life and the impact of this development on us will be extremely detrimental.

In the Council's own report the quarry will have a negative impact on the local community with dust and noise pollution, additionally the risk of flooding, damage to the landscape and biodiversity will be affected.

[More details about Rep ID: 24052](#)

Representation ID: [24044](#)

**OBJECT** Frances Overbury

Summary:

We oppose the proposed 300 acre quarry in Coddington. The quarry provides no local benefit and many deficits. The impact on the environment is a big factor. The quarry would bring 180 extra lorries on the already 'stretched' A17, noise, dust and damage to wildlife and local amenities. Also this quarry would open up great possibilities for more exploitation in the future.

[More details about Rep ID: 24044](#)

Representation ID: [24043](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs JL Gray

Summary:

Newark is making a tremendous effort to make the town a tourist attraction, with the museum, the civil war trail and the castle etc. The showground is also a great asset.

We are all aware of the traffic gridlock in the summer, with the town being on the route to the coast. To add industrial traffic which quarries would create could only be a deterrent to

visitors to the town.

Quarries would spoil the whole ambience of this beautiful area.

I am Newark born and bred for 84 years.

[More details about Rep ID: 24043](#)

Representation ID: [24028](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Paul Tunaley

Summary:

My main objection to the development of the Coddington site is in relation to road traffic. The increased level of traffic will cause further difficulties on already inadequate infrastructure. The roads are unsuitable for the potential volume of traffic involved and of course diverted traffic impinges on an area containing elderly persons' flats, and the local primary school.

A subsidiary objection relates to the loss of agricultural land, which can be ill-afforded in our overcrowded country as the loss of products from such land will lead to increased prices and possible food shortages.

Whilst Newark and Sherwood District are actively promoting the town as a tourist attraction, the additional traffic, dust and noise from the proposed development would more likely deter people from visiting the area, in particular the Air Museum on Drove Lane.

[More details about Rep ID: 24028](#)

Representation ID: [24002](#)

COMMENT National Grid Plc represented by AMEC (Julian Austin)

Summary:

The site is crossed by National Grid's high voltage overhead electricity transmission line (4VK route).

National Grid obtains the rights from individual landowners to place equipment on their land (it does not own the land). It is National Grid policy to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ (only major development or infrastructure of national importance would warrant consideration of relocation of existing lines).

National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. This is for two reasons, the amenity of potential occupiers of properties in the vicinity of lines and because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment.

The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24002](#)

## Justification

**Representation ID:** [24519](#)

**OBJECT** Trustees of Home Farm, Kelham represented by Savills (Mr Martin Ott)

Summary:

We object to the omission of Home Farm, Kelham as an allocated site. We are firmly of the view that the site is deliverable in the plan period. The site is well located to serve Nottingham and south Nottinghamshire. Other proposed allocations can only serve north Nottinghamshire.

Home Farm represents a more sustainable option than the new proposed sites at Coddington and Flash Farm. This is clearly shown on the Council's own sustainability appraisal (May 2014).

Change To Plan:

Allocate Home Farm, Kelham as a new sand and gravel site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24519](#)

## Coddington

Representation ID: [24513](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Kerry Hamilton

Summary:

I object to this proposal for the following reasons;

. I am very concerned about the potential health implications. Increased dust could aggravate people who suffer with respiratory problems.

. Increased traffic, the a17/a1/a46 is already an accident hotspot and are operating at full capacity. The proposed plans would see an extra 180 lorries on these roads. The infrastructure can not cope with these additional vehicles an nor can Coddington.

. Noise pollution will impact quality of life.

. The effect on wildlife and the natural habitat. These plans will severely affect Stapleford Woods

Change To Plan:

I do not believe that Coddington is a suitable site for a quarry due to its close proximity to the village.

[More details about Rep ID: 24513](#)

Representation ID: [24512](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Julian Dunlop

Summary:

I would reiterate comments about road capacity problems affecting this site; A17 site access would need a dedicated slip road, improvements to A46 / A1 Junction (adverse camber on roundabout A1 Northbound). Traffic overload every friday evening or when large show at Newark Showground eg. county show, LAMMA which in previous years has ground newark to a halt.

Environmental impact due to loss of habitat & noise pollution.

Change To Plan:

Improvements to Road network including a better pedestrian crossing point at roundabout A17/ Beckingham Road & Stapleford Lane and pedestrian access / cycle path along Drove lane / crossing A17.

For piece of mind to residents of Coddington I would suggest a partner organisation such as RSPB / Wildlife Trust should be sought to create a resource the local people would benefit from such as what has been created at Langford Lowfields at Collingham, this should incorporate walk & cycle paths surrounding the site and linking up with Stapleford Woods. The extraction should also be timebound eg. 2023 - 2030. Open ended extraction is clearly a worrying prospect however a timebound extraction with the promise of a nature resource at the end would go along way to mitigate the negative impacts.

[More details about Rep ID: 24512](#)

Representation ID: [24507](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Christopher Sykes

Summary:

Health,Safety,Environment,Local Economy

Change To Plan:

Reconsider location.

Looking at the geological surveys provided,there appear to be many more sites available where extraction would not impact communities to the extent of the Coddington proposal.

Prioritise the introduction of a policy of recycling materials.

"By 2030" as stated in your policy document,is too late.

This will reduce the need for quarrying and preserve finite resources.

Have a common policy with surrounding Councils to reduce duplication of supply,and concentrate extraction in areas of least impact.

No community should have to suffer a quarry on such a large scale.Any future proposal should be downsized significantly.

[More details about Rep ID: 24507](#)

Representation ID: [24506](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

There are concerns about an additional HGV access onto the A17 at Coddington due to the existing accident record on the road, and particularly due to the poor design of the staggered crossroads which leaves vehicles turning right off the A17 very exposed to impact with other vehicles from behind, head-on and from traffic exiting Drove Lane.

Change To Plan:

The processing plant needs to be at the Northern end of the Coddington site to reduce dust and noise impact on residential properties, and this would fit with a new link road or improvements to Drove Lane North of the A17, linking to the existing A46 / A1133 roundabout. Road improvements here would also improve traffic access to Newark Showground, Air Museum and the Car Auctions.

[More details about Rep ID: 24506](#)

Representation ID: [24505](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The MLP Transport Assessment recognised a cluster of accidents at the Drove Lane / A17 staggered crossroads - there is a problem with inappropriate overtaking, the 2 right-turn harbourages, and cyclists/pedestrians crossing to Drove Lane North. HGV traffic leaving even a well-designed junction/roundabout nearby will make this worse. Residents fear extra rat-run traffic diversion down Drove Lane (a pedestrian and dog-walking route, with a deceptive straight stretch ending in the village). Restricted or gated access between Drove Lane South and the A17 would help cushion residents and was requested as an addition to the Site Development Brief in Dec 2013.

Change To Plan:

1. Improvements needed to A17 bypass/Drove Lane junction to provide a safer crossing for pedestrians, cyclists and horses headed for footpaths, cycle tracks, bridle paths, and leisure amenities.
2. Beckingham Rd (via the Stapleford Wood A17) roundabout needs to become the main route into Coddington from the A17 bypass and the East.
3. The MP2o site export route, and site staff/supplier/ visitor traffic should be from the A46 via a new road to the north.

[More details about Rep ID: 24505](#)

Representation ID: [24504](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs P Garner

Summary:

The proposed site is wholly unsuitable for the location, this being far too close to the village of Coddington. It will affect all residents greatly, not least because the current road infrastructure will not cope (which will not only affect Coddington - Newark will also be affected by yet more traffic congestion) but in terms of noise, poor air quality as a result of dust, and destruction of the immediate surrounding rural environment.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington from the plan given its close proximity to the site.

[More details about Rep ID: 24504](#)

Representation ID: [24492](#)

**OBJECT** Sarah Webb

Summary:

This proposed site is close to a number of significant local amenities including the show ground, golf club, air museum, playing fields and amenity woodland that is an important area for wildlife. It is also very close to the village of Coddington. The local road infrastructure is already under strain. There plans clearly demonstrate that there will be significant impacts on the environment through noise and dust that will adversely affect local residents, users of nearby amenities and last for around 20 years without any real demonstrable benefits to the immediate area.

Change To Plan:

Decisions need to balance the need for minerals with the impacts on residents and the environment and prioritise areas where impacts are less. I also agree with a previous

comment that this type of planning should be undertaken collectively with other counties in particular Lincolnshire to ensure a coherent approach.

[More details about Rep ID: 24492](#)

Representation ID: [24484](#)

**OBJECT** Mr John Newton

Summary:

The proposed plan does not adequately address the infrastructure issues raised by the proposed development, in conjunction with other growth plans in the Newark area. Additionally the environmental impact for local residents, business and sports facilities will be significant as well as the impact on local flora and fauna of such a sizeable development.

Change To Plan:

Rather than Country boundaries forcing the development of a large mineral extraction area in Coddington, thought should be given to development of a joint plan with Lincolnshire to enable the proposed extraction to move away from urban areas to the more rural area between Lincoln and Newark.

[More details about Rep ID: 24484](#)

Representation ID: [24469](#)

**OBJECT** Mr John Barker

Summary:

Reconsider the proposal based on the above

Change To Plan:

This site should not be approved. Sites should be chosen further away from residents and where a safe road network has the capacity for significant additional volumes.

[More details about Rep ID: 24469](#)

Representation ID: [24429](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Worsening traffic congestion will affect the popularity and economics of leisure businesses near sites and cumulatively lower Newark's attractiveness as a place to live, trade or visit. The Coddington MP20 site is next to the Air Museum and Nottinghamshire County Showground (plus more businesses on Drove Lane), two village pubs within 600m, and Newark Golf Club. The Showground has already lost one major national event due to traffic difficulties. The adjacent businesses will suffer dust and noise (which cannot be eliminated) during extraction, grading and export 7am - 7pm, 5.5 days/week, but also at weekends when site maintenance is done.

Change To Plan:

The site should not be included in MLP. Chosen sites should be further away from existing leisure businesses and residents.

[More details about Rep ID: 24429](#)

Representation ID: [24428](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The true balance sheet of concentrating up to 70% of Notts gravel extraction in the Newark area for the next 20 years must include:

- costs (and side effects) of infrastructure support eg road/bridge maintenance over long distances;
- HGV carbon emissions over long distances to South Notts and Yorkshire;
- depression in value and income of businesses close to sites;
- cumulative decrease in the attractiveness of Newark as a market town and leisure/tourist destination with all the resulting economic impacts;
- additional healthcare costs (local populace and road accident victims);
- reduced value and saleability of houses in the area.

Change To Plan:

The MLP site selection strategy is flawed. More sites should be selected in South Notts closer to the Nottingham area where many of the development projects are.

[More details about Rep ID: 24428](#)

Representation ID: [24426](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Celia Smallwood

Summary:

I live very close to the proposed quarry and know this development would create huge noise, dust, disruption and interfere greatly with the wildlife in the area. The main issue for my objection is that of road safety as the A17 is a busy, dangerous road and there have been many accidents, some fatal, at roundabouts which connect the A1, A17 and A46. Why would there be plans to put more strain on an already dangerous, inadequate road? I urge you to think very carefully about this. This is the wrong location. I feel there are more sensible options available.

Change To Plan:

Drove Lane needs to be shut off completely from the A17 to stop HGVs and indeed other traffic from cutting through trying to avoid the busy A17. Traffic build up and huge jams and possible accidents through this lovely village would be intolerable. If Drove Lane was closed then at least the village would feel a little protected from the chaos and disruption.

[More details about Rep ID: 24426](#)

Representation ID: [24363](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Adrian Parrett

Summary:

Destroying green belt & ancient Stapleford woods use for recreation by the public & local Scout group(+90youngsters) over the years, Forest commission has planted oaks trees saplings in recent years, The Water table & ground water letdown effect on the woods, LGV's on A17 for North, South & West, will goes though A1/A46 junction & Newark By pass which is reported to be at capacity Now & Top 250 for road accident HA report April 14, Puts Business & Tourist Trade for Newark at High economic risk. River Trent LGV/Car Crossing Points Gunthorpe, Newark/Kelham & Dunham A75.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington site from the Whole Plan until a full & proper Independent Assessment of Road Network, Economy/Tourist Trade & improvement are made to Road network around Newark on Trent so it does not become place to avoid.

[More details about Rep ID: 24363](#)

Representation ID: [24354](#)

COMMENT Kathryn Gilmour

Summary:

I AM TOTALLY AGAINST THE PROPOSED QUARRY NEAR CODDINGTON.

The proposed quarry would create the following problems for local residents:

- Increase in HGV traffic making local roads more dangerous
- Noise, dust and lower house prices
- Poor air quality
- Damage to local environment
- Loss of quality farm land
- Difficult to sell houses in the area

It is irresponsible of the Council to consider a quarry so close to a highly populated residential area that will not benefit the Newark area at all and the proposal should be rejected.

[More details about Rep ID: 24354](#)

Representation ID: [24353](#)

**OBJECT** Newark Air Museum (Mr Howard Heeley)

Summary:

The air museum is concerned about the environmental impact this proposal may have on its nearby site - both through potential noise and dust generated during any extraction / post-extraction processing; and through additional HGV road movements to and from the proposed site. The A17 road already has a poor safety record in this area and the quarry would only increase those risks / safety issues.

Change To Plan:

Ideally alternative locations should be sought, which have a lower environmental impact on nearby homes, visitor attraction (e.g. Air Museum, the Newark Showground etc.) and where the vehicle implications are lower - this site has a major transport hub nearby, which already causes road issues to the surrounding area; including ignoring weight restrictions on various local roads.

[More details about Rep ID: 24353](#)

Representation ID: [24347](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

The site descriptions in the main 2014 consultation document do not present the same standard set of information allowing easy comparison of the sites - and they don't contain the site areas. The Coddington new greenfield site description blithely describes the site location as 6km from Newark but fails to disclose that the 127Ha site is only 300 metres from the village envelope of Coddington, with properties close to all the site boundaries, and a number within 100m.

Change To Plan:

Before making the draft Submission of the MLP ensure that the sites descriptions are comparable and include all the relevant information, particularly site sizes and distances to village envelopes.

[More details about Rep ID: 24347](#)

Representation ID: [24344](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Wendy Parrett

Summary:

Archaeology survey should be completed before any extraction is started.

Stapleford Woods is an ancient woodland could have detrimental effect, would be difficult to sustain the water table and have serious effect for trees, vegetation wildlife and birds. Extra traffic would exacerbate already heavily congested roads having adverse effects on Newark. Potentially making Newark a ghost town as tourist would avoid it, resulting in loss of shops and business.

Planning has already been given for nearby Swinderby Airfield, more vehicles culmination on Newark roads.

Coddington is a quiet village location, mineral extraction so close would spoil this, are minerals more important than people?

Change To Plan:

Even if the road network was improved, Stapleford Woods would still be under threat and Coddington village would be spoilt.

[More details about Rep ID: 24344](#)

Representation ID: [24341](#)

**OBJECT** Mr. Christopher Parrett

Summary:

Infrastructure cannot sustain this proposal, Highway Agency report April 2014. Ref.2.1.6 table 2.2 A46 listed in least reliable route report 1/4/12 to 31/3/13. Ref. 2.1.9 A1/A17/A46 notes very heavy trafficked subsequently journey time reliability along this route is poor and ranked 17 nationally. Ref. 4.4.9 A46 junction at Newark under pressure at present and any future development would exacerbate the problem. Ref. Capacity page 42 report - delays resulting in people avoiding Newark. Adverse impact on trade and business. Ref. 4.7.6 reads no improvements planned for A46/A1 Newark.

Change To Plan:

Until the infrastucture improvements are made, i.e A1/A46/A17 roundabouts, the road network cannot sustain the extra lorry movements projected.

[More details about Rep ID: 24341](#)

Representation ID: [24334](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Coddington MP2o stated markets: Nottingham and S Yorkshire exported through the A17-A1-A46 Newark intersections. Local people know this infrastructure is heavily used and under pressure - without any major new quarries. Highways Agency's N&E Midlands Route Strategy Evidence Report (April 2014) recognises capacity & safety issues, stating capacity improvements would be urgent by 2021 but has nothing planned yet. "No obvious solution - dualling the Newark bypass near impossible due to geographic constraints". Major Newark Growth Point necessitates improving 3 key roundabouts on A46 bypass/A1. Addressing Newark A46 pinch point also vital to Lincolnshire prosperity and Central Lincolnshire growth.

Change To Plan:

The Coddington site should be removed from the MLP and not reconsidered until there is a planned and funded strategy to significantly increase in capacity of the A46/A17/A1 junction and the A46 Newark Bypass. The strategy of c70% of Notts gravel production in the Newark area is flawed and should be rejected as unsustainable and logistically undeliverable.

[More details about Rep ID: 24334](#)

Representation ID: [24330](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The road network around the proposed Coddington site is already one of the most unreliable in the region without the addition of 180 HGV movements a day from a new quarry. The Highways Agency April 2014 report on the North and East Midlands Route Strategy identifies the A46 in the Newark area to be in the top 10 for unreliable journeys (A617 to A1 section, and A1133 to A1 section) along the route under current traffic levels, and forecasts further capacity constraints and increased traffic casualty risks from the new housing planned for the Newark Growth Point.

Change To Plan:

The Coddington site should be removed from the MLP until there is a planned and funded strategy to provide for a significant increase in capacity of the A46/A17/A1 junction and the A46 Newark Bypass.

[More details about Rep ID: 24330](#)

Representation ID: [24327](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Mark Ross

Summary:

Increased road use, the A17 already at maximum use; impact on other roads, i.e. A46 and A1 and also impact on A46/A1/A17 roundabout; concerns over lorries using Beckingham Road or Drove Lane as a shortcut; increased traffic from vehicles of quarry staff again using Beckingham Road and Drove Lane as a "rat run"; impact on Stapleford Woods and wildlife; water being taken from the ground for the process; also process can cause flooding in other

areas, impact on nearby houses; microparticles in the air being breathed in; constant dirty house windows and dusty car; impact on house prices in Coddington.

Change To Plan:

I do not feel this is an appropriate place for a sand and gravel quarry as it is too close to a residential area. I, therefore, strongly object.

[More details about Rep ID: 24327](#)

Representation ID: [24309](#)

**OBJECT** Mr John Marsh

Summary:

1) As proposed we will see and hear the processing unit from the rear of our house in Old Hall Gardens

2) My employment history make me well qualified to comment on this matter.

3) Noise and Dust will penetrate the whole of Coddington.

4) The added traffic flow will, at times of stress within the local road system, cause chaos in Coddington especially at school times and during events at Newark showground.

5) More care than is normal should be taken over re-instatement definitions and agreements.

6) The land should be returned to agricultural use.

Change To Plan:

1) The plan should be rejected.

2) The processing unit/inlet/exit should be moved to the north west of the site with access onto the A46.

3) Tree planting should be carried out 5 years ahead of other site development.

4) Tight agreement on returning the land to agricultural use and backed by bonds should be included in any approval.

[More details about Rep ID: 24309](#)

Representation ID: [24297](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Nigel English

Summary:

Rather than individuals making requests under the Freedom of Information Act. Could all documentation correspondence and minutes etc in relation the the proposed quarrying be made publicly available so as to be completely transparent in your actions and decisions, and to keep cost down.

Change To Plan:

Make public all documents.

[More details about Rep ID: 24297](#)

Representation ID: [24296](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Nigel English

Summary:

I am concerned in relation to the impact on the water table, contamination of the water table and water courses and the effects on the local woodland and wildlife.

Has a full assessment in relationship to this been carried out. If so can it be published.

Change To Plan:

Carry our assessment and publish results.

[More details about Rep ID: 24296](#)

Representation ID: [24185](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Carla L'Abbate

Summary:

I commute daily on this route and it cannot take more traffic. The roads have to be resurfaced twice a year and there are so many accidents that it is just not feasible to put a quarry here. Also, as I am looking to sell my house, I feel this is going to be detrimental to the housing market. I strongly object to this.

Change To Plan:

No Quarry to be placed here at all. In the extreme circumstance that this is ignored then the access route should be via the A46 and NOT the A17.

[More details about Rep ID: 24185](#)

Representation ID: [24148](#)

**OBJECT** Ms Heather Chamberlain

Summary:

i feel that this would be detrimental to the landscape of coddington, put the safety of residents at risk, undermine the foundations of the surrounding buildings and roadways, the number of heavy lorries would be unsustainable on these roads.

Change To Plan:

moved to a safer area

[More details about Rep ID: 24148](#)

Representation ID: [24146](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jennifer Milne

Summary:

I object on several grounds:

Noise

Dust and air pollution

Devaluation of homes in village

Transport - the roads around Newark regularly clog up already it will be worse with a lot more lorries from the quarry. We don't need it, the sand & gravel will be transported to the

other end of the county (past other existing quarries which could be extended instead) but we will get all the disruption and disadvantages not the people who want the end product.  
Change To Plan:

Do not approve the application

[More details about Rep ID: 24146](#)

Representation ID: [24145](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Peter Thorpe

Summary:

I strongly believe that this development is completely unsuitable for the location, and is too close to residential areas and schools. It places too great a strain on already overloaded infrastructure. Noise, pollution, air quality and road safety issues will undoubtedly result.

In my opinion this development has not been adequately thought through.

Change To Plan:

The development needs to be completely rethought. There is no way it should go ahead in such close proximity to residential areas. The needs of the county appear to have been put in front of those who live and work there.

[More details about Rep ID: 24145](#)

Representation ID: [24022](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Michael Cox

Summary:

The washing plant and loading area is in direct line of sight of my house and therefore i will be able to hear the noise, also in spring the wind direction is often from this way therefore I will be affected by dust.

This is evidenced by the fact that I can clearly hear activities in the showground.

I will be affected by increased traffic both by noise and access to the A46 eastbound via the usual route along drove lane.

This also affects my access to the Sustrans cycle route to Lincoln by making the Drove lane crossing more hazardous.

Change To Plan:

Improved crossing arrangements at A17/Drove lane, by providing a bridge or roundabout, although roundabouts are not friendly to cyclists.

Restrictions on further encroachment, across the A17 and northward towards Danethorpe. There must be a clear gap to the woods at Stapleford.

On completion the area must be returned to viable farmland and not used for landfill or allowed to become another expanse of water.

[More details about Rep ID: 24022](#)

Representation ID: [24020](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Linda Cox

Summary:

I strongly object to the proposed Local Mineral Plan because:

1. increased heavy traffic on A17, making access to Winthorpe, air museum, showground and rural bike rides more difficult and dangerous over a prolonged period (my lifetime).
2. forcing traffic onto the C208 disrupting the village.
3. noise, (the operation will be visible from our house and therefore be audible).
4. devaluation of house price.
5. damage to wild life, trees and woodland. Experience in the area suggests this will be a foothold for further exploitation and possible land fill operations.
6. NCC accept that there will be a negative impact but are still wanting approval

Change To Plan:

1. The policy is not adopted. The Council should listen to the public of the area.
2. improvements to the road infra structure to provide safeguards if the plan goes ahead.e.g. bridge over A17 at Drove Lane, no lorries drive through the village without exception (C 208)
3. tree planting to form noise barrier between the village and A17
4. High standard of plant management to reduce noise and dust.
5. Plan to restore agricultural land post excavation not another pseudo nature reserve.
6. Strict planning to limit further encroachment on rural community.

[More details about Rep ID: 24020](#)

## Appendix 1: Policies Map and inset maps

### **Representation ID: [24514](#)**

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

#### Summary:

Sustainability matrix for Coddington MP2O is overoptimistic in favour of development and needs reassessing. I have written a background paper (sent separately) discussing my objections to the assessment against:

Objective 4 (protect historic environment above/below ground)

Objective 5 (protect-enhance landscape/townscape character)

I believe that the value of the area of the allocation MP2o has been downgraded in the Multiple Environment Sensitivity assessment, and consequently the negative impacts against sustainability objectives 4 and 5 have been judged lower than they deserve to be. Coddington MP2o should not have been selected as a suitable site.

#### Change To Plan:

1 Coddington MP2o's sustainability matrix scores should be revised for the reasons in my submission.

2 Allocation MP2o should be removed from the MLP.

[More details about Rep ID: 24514](#)

### **Representation ID: [24340](#)**

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

#### Summary:

The Additional Consultation Document fails to group together the areas of the sites, their total mineral reserve, annual extraction rates and projected site lifetimes. This conceals the enormity of new greenfield sites with late starting dates and the impacts on those living next to them.

eg MP2o Coddington - 4 million Tonnes (within plan) 2023 to beyond plan period - this really means 127 Ha site, total of 9.5 MTonnes, 500,000 Tonnes pa and duration of 2023 -2042 (plus site establishment & restoration - excluding any extensions).

#### Change To Plan:

The Draft Submission Document should properly summarise the site information to aid public consultation.

[More details about Rep ID: 24340](#)

## MP2o - Coddington

Representation ID: [25713](#)

**OBJECT** English Heritage (Ms Claire Searson)

Summary:

We note the amended development brief - we consider that whilst it is positive that heritage assets are recognised, there is no indicator as to how these issues should be addressed. Our standard wording should be included here

For the purposes of the development brief the reference to specific survey types, is not required at this stage as it may close down other appropriate assessment tools. English Heritage would advise the full complement of archaeological survey techniques are used to identify the full breadth of potential archaeological remains which would not readily be identified or appropriately evaluated through a strategy based exclusively on a single method of survey.

We would be happy with a form of words within the development brief requiring archaeological assessment, however, without restricting this to specific assessment types.

Change To Plan:

Include standard wording:

"Protection and, where possible, enhancement of the significance and setting of heritage assets, including, [list specific assets as necessary], must be ensured through both minerals extraction proposals and through future restoration and after-care proposals. A heritage assessment is required to be submitted as part of any application"

Remove reference to specific survey methods for archaeology, include instead reference to requirement for archaeological assessment.

[More details about Rep ID: 25713](#)

Representation ID: [24510](#)

**OBJECT** Miss Nicola Spendlove

Summary:

Inappropriate siting of largest new sand/gravel quarry in Nottinghamshire, which will have a major detrimental effect on the amenity value of the area for the following reasons:

- 1- Road Traffic Management - inappropriate transport links for the number and type of vehicles (180 lorries / day + site traffic), causing congestion and accidents
- 2- Excessive continuous Noise and Light levels from site operations, processing and material transport
- 3- Dust and Pollution by silica which is a known hazard to health, causing serious respiration conditions
- 4- Visual and Actual Impact on the landscape and wildlife
- 5- Too close to a residential area
- 6- 20 year+ Timescale

Change To Plan:

Choose a more appropriate location for the quarry, well away from residential areas like Coddington.

[More details about Rep ID: 24510](#)

Representation ID: [24508](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

There are several trees with TPOs within the site that are in need of protection, plus woodland and SINCs within and at the edge of the proposed Coddington quarry:

- Stapleford Woods - Ancient Woodland
- Moor Brats - Deciduous Woodland BAP
- Moor Brats Drain SINC
- Langford Moor SINC

There is real concern that extraction around and adjacent the woodland, trees and nature conservation sites, combined with the lowering of the water table, would cause severe and irreversible damage to these important nature reserves in the area with a significant loss of wildlife/amenity to the local population.

Change To Plan:

There must be large standoffs provided around all of the important trees, woodland and nature reserves in the area, and water table monitoring and management via controlled and limited area extraction to restrict the amount of unsustainable environmental damage to trees and wildlife.

[More details about Rep ID: 24508](#)

Representation ID: [24501](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

As a local resident and walking group member I reject the application Coddington MP2o. If the site were to be worked I support RSPB'S comment for partial restoration to acid grassland and heathland (historically relevant for Coddington Great Moor) but agree with NCC that the high quality (Grade 2 and 3a) soils must be restored to high quality agricultural land to conserve 'Winthorpe Farms' type Sandlands landscape. I support Newark & Sherwood's comments on TPOs, but I reject Hanson's proposal of 'water and nature conservation uses' - open water is totally alien to Coddington's landscape.

Change To Plan:

The Coddington Site Development Brief should insist on the 'Best and most versatile land' being restored to high quality agricultural land.

[More details about Rep ID: 24501](#)

Representation ID: [24494](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

I would respectfully remind NCC that in response to comments by Mr Graham Collyer, Coddington Parish Council, Mrs Donna Payne, Mrs Celia Smallwood, Stuart Arkwell, Fred

Reed and 52 others, Mr K B Tomlinson, Mrs Jackie Armstrong and Mr JE Payne they stated that they would amend the Coddington MP2o Site Development Brief to include 'stand-off' areas. These are required on the site to insulate ecologically sensitive areas (to protect tree roots and fauna) and along site boundaries to provide an area in which to create banks and tree screening (to protect residents and nearby businesses from the workings).

Change To Plan:

Include the requirement for suitable standoff areas and noise / visual screening banks in the Coddington Site Development Brief.

[More details about Rep ID: 24494](#)

Representation ID: [24487](#)

**OBJECT** Barnby in the Willows Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Wellard)

Summary:

The current infrastructure surrounding the site and the wider area of Newark is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic on a daily basis. Another 180 slow moving heavy lorries to and from the quarry everyday would be complete overload. The A17 proposed access is a single carriageway with a high concentration of lorries and holiday traffic and the scene of frequent accidents bringing traffic to a standstill across a wide area. Newark and its approach roads are often gridlocked. There has to be a comprehensive and inclusive strategy for all of the Newark area's future development.

Change To Plan:

Improved road network

[More details about Rep ID: 24487](#)

Representation ID: [24479](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Andrew Mellors

Summary:

In summary, I object to the proposal on the basis that the extraction would potentially lead to the loss of a local community facility and may adversely effect the health of local children should the club continue

Change To Plan:

The location of the proposed site and its access would need to be significantly further away from Winthorpe and Coddington Tigers

[More details about Rep ID: 24479](#)

Representation ID: [24441](#)

**OBJECT** Winthorpe & Coddington Tigers Youth Football Club (Mr Stuart O'Neil)

Summary:

Having assessed the plans provided during the consultation period, it is evident that should plans be approved the location of said site would have a terminal impact upon the continued operation of the Winthorpe & Coddington Youth Football club and force the club to close its doors. As a result, many children would loose access to such a wonderful and safe learning environment and for some their only opportunity. Our view as a club is therefore a full rejection of the plans!

Change To Plan:

Due to the proposed location, we are unable to see any changes that may change the view of the club from anything other than a full rejection.

[More details about Rep ID: 24441](#)

Representation ID: [24427](#)

**OBJECT** Coddington Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Wellard)

Summary:

\*Inadequate local road network for current and planned developments. The Strategic Traffic Assessment seriously underestimates the current inadequacy of the entire road network of Newark.

\*A lack of strategic planning beyond the MLP. Too many disjointed economic activities and future plans. N&SDC's Local Development Framework includes further development between the A46 and A17. Proposals should be given proper consideration and preparation of a comprehensive strategic plan involving Highways Agency, Lincs Co Co, N&SDC, EMAS, major local employers and organisations.

\*No reference made to power lines, or gas and oil pipelines crossing the site.

\*No detailed health impact data available.

Change To Plan:

Coordinated vision and comprehensive strategic planning for the whole area.

Improvements to local road network

[More details about Rep ID: 24427](#)

Representation ID: [24369](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment analysis of cumulative highway congestion from sites close together systematically understates HGV vehicle totals by using a 28 tonne capacity vehicle for its calculations. Coddington PC was advised by Hanson UK to use a 20 Tonne uplift for its 2013 responses, and this proved consistent with published responses made Brett Aggregates and others. The assessment should be based on a more realistic 20 Tonne basis, since principal export routes also include single-carriageway A-roads and 28 tonne HGVs would be too large or cumbersome for smaller customers.

Change To Plan:

The Strategic Transport Assessment should be revised to include a realistic analysis not a best-case scenario. Future more detailed Transport Assessments (required for sites later in the approval process) should provide data on their vehicle-capacity export pattern.

[More details about Rep ID: 24369](#)

Representation ID: [24368](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment does not consider the impact of road traffic due to site employees, contractors, maintenance vehicles or visitors. Neither does it consider traffic

due to site restoration processes, which can run in parallel to export on large sites but potentially add many years to site activity (and to the problems experienced by local communities).

Change To Plan:

Detailed site Transport Assessments required later in the approval process should include the impact of all site traffic over the full site life cycle, not just HGV vehicle export movements during extraction.

[More details about Rep ID: 24368](#)

Representation ID: [24367](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment identifies the cumulative impact from the Langford sites but fails to recognise that they feed into the same series of stressed Newark A46 roundabouts as the Coddington and Cromwell sites, and the broader impact from new quarries and other developments in Lincolnshire. Nevertheless, it does recognise that Coddington MP2o is one of seven sites with which the Accident and Investigation Unit stated there are concerns/issues. This is not in accord with the comments made by NCC to responses in the 2013 public consultation: "no significant issues have been raised regarding the Coddington allocation."

Change To Plan:

The Strategic Transport Assessment site-matrices and the report conclusions should be thoroughly reviewed. The results should then be fed into the MLP documents, and NCC replies to public contributions revised as necessary.

[More details about Rep ID: 24367](#)

Representation ID: [24360](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- sensitive receptors should be red as there are no footpaths along the roads surrounding the site, and the roads link pedestrian public rights of way and bridleways

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible sensitive receptors score for the Coddington site, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24360](#)

Representation ID: [24359](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- export route should be amber or red, as the site access onto a busy single carriageway road will restrict HGV access routes to and from the site

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible export route score for the Coddington site, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24359](#)

Representation ID: [24358](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- export mode should be red, as the developer has stated that exports will not be restricted to 28T HGVs

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible export mode score for the Coddington site, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24358](#)

Representation ID: [24357](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- access should be red, as there is no existing access and the District Council are objecting to the development on traffic impact grounds

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible access score for the Coddington site, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24357](#)

Representation ID: [24356](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- type of site should be red, as there is no history of quarrying in the area

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible type of site score for Coddington, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24356](#)

Representation ID: [24355](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Strategic Transport Assessment report is excessively optimistic in its matrix scoring of the proposed new quarry at Coddington - it should be rescored properly using the stated criteria in the report. Had a credible STA assessment been made, the Site Selection paper case for site MP2o would have led to it not being included in the MLP.

- site duration multiplier should be high (red) given the expected lifetime of around 20 years

Change To Plan:

The report should be revised to provide a credible site duration multiplier for the Coddington site, based on the actual site characteristics.

[More details about Rep ID: 24355](#)

Representation ID: [24345](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The Sustainability Appraisal for the additional consultation on sand and gravel shows, for the first time, the processing plant location for the Coddington site to lie directly underneath the 400 kV overhead lines. This cannot be acceptable from a safety viewpoint to either the site operator or to National Grid. The plant location is also only 400 metres from the village envelope, causing unacceptable levels of noise, dust and light pollution to many residents in the village.

Change To Plan:

Before being included in the draft Submission of the MLP, the processing plant must be relocated to the North edge of the site to be remote from the village, while avoiding the flood risk zone and power and gas / oil infrastructure crossing the site. This would place the processing plant 1100 metres from the village envelope while keeping it distant from farms, the Air Museum and Newark Showground.

[More details about Rep ID: 24345](#)

Representation ID: [24328](#)

**OBJECT** Miss Sarah Blount

Summary:

The air pollution from the plant will have an adverse effect on people's health; the noise will disrupt the peace and quiet of the village, particularly at night; the plant will be an eyesore on the country landscape, particularly at night when it will be brightly lit; the increase in traffic will cause disruption on an already busy A17 and if diverted through the village, will raise an issue of safety for children at the primary school; property prices will be decreased by having the plant so near the village; and the adverse effect on wildlife in Stapleford Woods.

Change To Plan:

I strongly object to this plant being situated so close to the village for all the reasons given above.

[More details about Rep ID: 24328](#)

Representation ID: [24325](#)

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

Summary:

The site at Coddington does not appear to readily deliverable, given the major infrastructure crossing the site. This includes the 400kV transmission line and towers, the GPSS pipeline, a high pressure gas main, and a high voltage local transmission line. When combined with the large flood risk area to the North end of the site and the need for significant screening and standoffs, these will reduce both site capacity and the time required to develop the new quarry, so may not be commercially viable.

Change To Plan:

The MLP should not include the new greenfield Coddington site capacity until the deliverability of the site has been established.

[More details about Rep ID: 24325](#)

Representation ID: [24313](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Adrian Parrett

Summary:

Destroying green belt & ancient Stapleford woods use for recreation by the public & local Scout group(+90youngsters) over the years, Forest commission has planted oaks trees saplings in recent years, The Water table & ground water letdown effect on the woods, LGV's on A17 for North, South & West, will goes though A1/A46 junction & Newark By pass which is reported to be at capacity Now & Top 250 for road accident HA report April 14, Puts Business & Tourist Trade for Newark at High economic risk. River Trent LGV/Car Crossing Points Gunthorpe, Newark/Kelham & Dunham A75.

Change To Plan:

Remove Coddington site from the Whole Plan until a full & proper Independent Assessment of Road Network, Economy/Tourist Trade & improvement are made to Road network around Newark on Trent so it does not become to avoid.

[More details about Rep ID: 24313](#)

Representation ID: [24311](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Sarah Toogood

Summary:

We object to this proposal due to grave concerns about the impact and extent that this industrial site will pollute the environment where we live, which would affect our mental and physical health from breathing in elevated dust and pollution, as well as suffering additional noise levels.

For many of us the longevity of this blight on the landscape and increased health risk would be for the remainder of our lifetimes.

For the sake of building houses and roads we find this threat to our health & wellbeing unacceptable.

Statements 'minimising' or 'mitigating' the impacts seem vague, unquantified, and not at all reassuring.

Change To Plan:

Reject as too close to large population

[More details about Rep ID: 24311](#)

Representation ID: [24158](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Campbell

Summary:

A quarry will have an extremely detrimental effect on wildlife in and around the Stapleford Wood area. The levels of dust and toxicity created are likely to damage and even kill trees and wildlife that have been native to the area for many years.

At a time when much is being made of preserving wildlife and woodland I consider any threat to these as being unwelcome.

Change To Plan:

Reject the proposal.

[More details about Rep ID: 24158](#)

Representation ID: [24156](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Campbell

Summary:

People have invested tens of thousands of pounds to live in Coddington because of the environment. It is quiet, away from the main town, close to very attractive amenities, such as Stapleford Woods, the countryside in general, close to main links North/South and to the East Coast.

All the reasons we moved to the village will be under threat. The roads will be choked, the amenities compromised and the property values adversely affected for many, many years.

Change To Plan:

If it were to go ahead I cannot see how you can change the plans to avoid this issue.

[More details about Rep ID: 24156](#)

Representation ID: [24155](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Campbell

Summary:

There are a good number of retired and elderly in Coddington, as well as a facility at the edge of the village for disabled individuals.

Clearly, additional impact on the environment from dust/noise and air pollution in general will be detrimental to the health of these residents, as well as the children living here.

Change To Plan:

There is no answer to this.

[More details about Rep ID: 24155](#)

Representation ID: [24154](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Campbell

Summary:

Coddington village is a small and peaceful village with a wide variety of residents.

Young families use the local school, across the main road from the village, and are concerned about the safety of young people going to and from if vehicles utilise the village roads, even if rarely (e.g. in case of accidents on trunk roads).

Change To Plan:

NO HGV TRAFFIC CAN BE ALLOWED INTO THE VILLAGE. THERE IS ALREADY A 7.5 TONNE RESTRICTION, BUT THIS ISN'T ALWAYS OBSERVED EVEN NOW.

[More details about Rep ID: 24154](#)

Representation ID: [24153](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Robert Campbell

Summary:

According to Highways Agency and other environmental bodies the roads infrastructure around the A1/A17 and their connecting links are already FULLY COMMITTED and cannot accept further traffic movements.

If this goes ahead there will be much more additional traffic than the 180 additional HGV movements, as there will be staff, suppliers, maintenance vehicles, and other visitors arriving and departing at regular intervals.

In addition should there be accidents or holdups/road works etc there will be a tendency for traffic to divert right through the village, increasing danger to our children, elderly and disabled.

Change To Plan:

All the roads system needs major update. Newark is regularly grid locked, without this additional traffic, when there are road works or accidents on any trunk route around the town.

Should this development take place the town will suffer even more.

[More details about Rep ID: 24153](#)