

# Minerals Local Plan Preferred Approach Document 2013 Comments re: Coddington

## Contents

Contents.....	1
Plan 1: Overview of the Plan Area .....	2
MP2: Sand and gravel provision .....	3
MP2: Sand and gravel provision, MP2o Coddington .....	10
Site Information .....	17
MP2o - Coddington .....	19
Sustainability Appraisal.....	21

## Plan 1: Overview of the Plan Area

Representation ID: [23802](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Plan 1 on page 18 should show principal growth areas in the county.

Change To Plan:

Identify principal growth areas on Plan 1

[More details about Rep ID: 23802](#)

(This includes a 48 page PDF file, not included here)

## MP2: Sand and gravel provision

Representation ID: [23922](#)

COMMENT Tessa Rentoul

Summary:

We support the revised proposals for the Flash Farm submitted by Mick George to this consultation. The site can make a valuable contribution to the mineral supply provision within the County providing a greater degree of competition in the market place dominated by a single producer throughout the entire Plan period.

Valuable contributions to the County's Biodiversity Action Plan will be forthcoming through restoration (which is fully supported by the landowners) and this will be in conjunction with a permanent extension to the flood storage capacity within the Trent Valley.

A quarry can be developed without removing any sections of any hedgerows whatsoever within the site which one suspects is unique in any of the sites promoted within the Plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 23922](#)

Representation ID: [23921](#)

**OBJECT** Mr Roy Hunt

Summary:

Once again we are asked our views on an application for sand/gravel extraction in our village of Little Carlton.

The dirt, noise and extra traffic would make village life a misery. In the last year the volume of traffic and farm tractors has increased greatly. Most of the cars and lorries coming down Debdale Hill on the A616 speed up as they pass though the village.

Plus any accident or break down on the A1 brings more as the diversions are through and around the village.

The recent repair of Kelham Bridge brought all the surrounding roads to a standstill.

Another concern is the level of the water table. We have been told it is quite high in this area. I understand the need for sand and gravel extraction but please not in any village.

[More details about Rep ID: 23921](#)

Representation ID: [23902](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Submission promoting the Flash Farm site near Averham:

- Raises doubts about the deliverability of certain sites in the Plan compared to the

immediate proposals for Flash Farm.

- Highlights that a preference for extensions should not be used to exclude entry to new operators in the County
- The apportionment for sand and gravel should be increased as future demand has been underestimated.
- Notes that a very significant proportion of the mineral to be worked within the plan period is within the direct control of a single operator which could be considered anti-competitive.

Recognises that previously only limited details had been provided; this submission now provides details required to assist the assessment process. The area now promoted is significantly modified, keeping the operations further away from the village of Averham.

It is considered that on balance, with appropriate mitigation, the proposal to extract sand and gravel and import suitable inert material to achieve beneficial after use on land at Flash Farm, can be carried out in an acceptable manner, without causing demonstrable harm. The proposed restoration reflects County Council objectives and governmental advice, applying best environmental practices and realising habitat creation initiatives.

[More details about Rep ID: 23902](#)

Representation ID: [23779](#)

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

Summary:

Policy requires more information on permitted reserves at each site and reserve shortfall. Policy should set out anticipated reserves for the proposed allocations to demonstrate shortfall/surplus over the Plan period. Using the policy justification there is a requirement to supply 49 million tonnes of sand and gravel over the Plan period. Existing permitted reserves are 19 million tonnes, leaving a shortfall of 30 million tonnes. The allocations total 24 million tonnes leaving a shortfall of 6 million tonnes. We believe additional sites at Home Farm, Kelham, and Langford West should be allocated to meet this shortfall.

Change To Plan:

Provide more detail on permitted reserves within Policy MP2 for each site. Allocate additional sites at:

- Home Farm, Kelham
- Langford West

[More details about Rep ID: 23779](#)

Representation ID: [23741](#)

**SUPPORT** Rotherham Sand and Gravel Ltd represented by RPS Planning (Mr Jonathan Standen)

Summary:

Rotherham Sand and Gravel Co. Ltd supports the inclusion of MP2c Scrooby North and MP2d Scrooby South within Draft Policy MP2.

[More details about Rep ID: 23741](#)

Representation ID: [23732](#)

SUPPORT Mr Richard Green

Summary:

Erewash Borough Council supports the preferred approach document; in particular:

Policy MP2 : Sand and gravel provision

Policy MP11: Coal - Particularly the criteria for the proposal to be environmentally acceptable

Policy MP12: Hydrocarbons - Particularly the criteria that proposals will be supported provided they do not give rise to any unacceptable impacts on the environment or residential amenity.

[More details about Rep ID: 23732](#)

Representation ID: [23719](#)

COMMENT Newark and Sherwood District Council (Matthew Tubb)

Summary:

Six sites have been identified in the Besthorpe and Langford (SGh, MP2e, MP2f, SGj, MP2i and MP2h) area and the District Council is therefore concerned that this does not give rise to detrimental cumulative impact on the local environment or the amenity of local residents.

The phased approach, ensuring no more than 2 of these sites are operational at one time, should help to minimise the impacts which could arise from development occurring concurrently across the sites and so is supported.

Due to their proximity there is the strong potential for these sites to provide a network of linked Green Infrastructure through their restoration. This approach would reflect the aims of the District's Green Infrastructure Strategy and would therefore be supported.

The proposed restoration schemes are supported, in particular where they incorporate flood risk alleviation measures. It is also crucial that the approaches to restoration reflect the recommendations of the District's Landscape Character Assessment; this appears to be the case and so is supported.

[More details about Rep ID: 23719](#)

Representation ID: [23700](#)

SUPPORT Burton Joyce Preservation Society (Richard Fife)

Summary:

Burton Joyce Preservation Society fully supports the provisional decision in the Minerals Plan Preferred Options to exclude site PA07 (Bulcote Farm) as a potential site for mineral extraction. We entirely endorse the motion recently passed by Burton Joyce Parish Council to this effect, and also the representations of the Burton Joyce Residents' Association. This Society is in full agreement with the findings expressed in the Preferred Options that the increased flood risk, damage to human health, injury to wildlife, the natural environment and landscape would be unacceptable if mineral extraction were to be allowed on this site. We consider the site could only be considered economically viable by ignoring the fact that

the true costs would not be paid by the extraction industry, but overwhelmingly by the resident community in this area.

[More details about Rep ID: 23700](#)

Representation ID: [23611](#)

COMMENT R.S.P.B. (Central Region) (Mr Colin Wilkinson)

Summary:

The RSPB encourages the Council to allocate the Langfield West site.

Being a riparian site, Langfield West would be a key component in the delivery of Water Framework Directive objectives in Nottinghamshire. Langfield West could include re-connecting the River Trent with its floodplain, naturalising the river channel, flood alleviation, management of diffuse pollution and improved riparian public access. Allocating Langfield West would have the added benefit of enabling these Water Framework Directive objectives to be delivered on both sides of the river, providing double the benefits. These benefits could not be achieved on a non-riparian allocation.

The site would also make a valuable addition to the biodiversity-led restoration of the Langford / Besthorpe / Cromwell complex, bringing the total area of this complex to over 600ha. This would make this complex of sites one of the most important in the country for landscape-scale creation of priority habitats on restored mineral sites.

Finally, it is worth noting that Langford West has a better Sustainability Appraisal score than many of the allocated sites, especially in the long-term.

Change To Plan:

Include Langford West

[More details about Rep ID: 23611](#)

Representation ID: [23440](#)

**OBJECT** English Heritage (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge)

Summary:

Historic environment issues do not always get reflected in the development briefs. We also have concerns about cumulative impacts on the historic environment. A number of preferred sites are partly or wholly located within areas of Highest Environmental Sensitivity. We question whether it is suitable to allocate such sites given the constraints. A number of development briefs require proposals to "consider" the impact on heritage assets. This seems rather vague and does not make clear that the significance and setting of heritage assets should be protected and enhanced.

Change To Plan:

Amend development briefs to be clearer on historic environment issues for specific sites.

Consider suitability of sites in areas of Highest Environmental Sensitivity.

[More details about Rep ID: 23440](#)

Representation ID: [23401](#)

COMMENT The Bell Family Trust represented by Fisher German LLP (Mr William Gagie)

Summary:

Insufficient sites have been identified to meet the target provision (upon which we have commented elsewhere.) Some of the sites included in the existing provision have question marks regarding their deliverability and we therefore feel other sites should be allocated, especially where this can be done through the use of extensions to existing sites rather than through new sites.

We feel that site PA27, Manor Farm, Spalford should be reconsidered as an extension to Girton Quarry. Girton is a quarry where the principle of extensions is accepted and has the capacity for barge transport too.

[More details about Rep ID: 23401](#)

Representation ID: [23354](#)

SUPPORT Roberta Prime

Summary:

I was delighted to note that following the detailed and through research (as set out in background papers) to select sites, both Bulcote Farm and the two Shelford sites were rejected. You clearly acknowledge that:

- both sites lie within an area of multiple environmental sensitivity (with lots of ecological and historical 'hotspots') and high flood risk
- the impact of climate change in the future is highly to exacerbating flooding
- economic considerations should not take precedence over environmental and community factors

National guidance states that inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided by directing development away from areas of highest risk. The sustainability appraisal document makes it clear that the negative impacts upon the environment and communities for these sites far outweigh economic considerations and that no amount of 'mitigation' would ever make them acceptable.

[More details about Rep ID: 23354](#)

Representation ID: [23301](#)

SUPPORT Burton Joyce Residents Association represented by Gillian Newman

Summary:

We note with satisfaction the exclusion of the Bulcote Farm site and strongly endorse the negative findings listed in the Sustainability Appraisal. The conclusions accord with objections we have made for many years; any gravel extraction would impact very adversely on the health and lives of adjacent communities, increase the risk of serious flooding and could cause subsidence to buildings nearby through de-watering.

It makes insufficient reference to dust, noise and risks to safety connected with extraction in a relatively densely populated area. Further, it would seriously damage local biodiversity, the historic environment and valuable landscape.

We strongly urge that the Bulcote Farm site remain excluded from the Local Minerals Plan. Serious consideration should be given to removing it entirely from all future Minerals Plans.  
[More details about Rep ID: 23301](#)

Representation ID: [23208](#)

SUPPORT Broxtowe Borough Council (Mr Dave Lawson)

Summary:

The Council welcomes the absence of proposals for sand and gravel extraction west of the City, as any additional processing at the Attenborough plant would be liable to cause serious harm to the Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI and to local residential amenity.

[More details about Rep ID: 23208](#)

Representation ID: [23162](#)

SUPPORT Burton Joyce Parish Council (Mrs Jackie Dawn)

Summary:

Burton Joyce Parish Council notes with satisfaction the exclusion of site PA07, Bulcote Farm, from those which might be approved for gravel extraction in the preferred option for the new County Minerals Plan currently being finalised. We strongly endorse the conclusions in the proposed document that extraction in our area would impact very adversely on flood risk; would score very negatively in respect of human health and quality of life; would badly reduce local biodiversity; and would have further negative effects on historic environment and landscape. This Council therefore strongly urges that this area remains, after final consultation, excluded from any possible aggregate extraction.

[More details about Rep ID: 23162](#)

Representation ID: [23156](#)

SUPPORT Shelford Against Gravel Extraction (SAGE) (Mr J R Whysall)

Summary:

Shelford Against Gravel Extraction supports the Council's recognition from the Issues and Options stage as to the importance of in selecting sand and gravel sites:

- a) Minimising flood risk
- b) Protecting agricultural land
- c) Looking to the extension of existing sites rather than allocating new ones

[More details about Rep ID: 23156](#)

Representation ID: [23120](#)

SUPPORT Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (Local Development Framework)

Summary:

A number of site identified in Policy MP2 (sand and gravel provision) will contribute towards supplying aggregate mineral to the Doncaster area and South Yorkshire region. This has been evidenced in our Local Aggregate Assessment.

[More details about Rep ID: 23120](#)

Representation ID: [23116](#)

COMMENT Mrs Greta Johnson and 2 others

Summary:

We would agree with existing proposals to use the existing gravel extraction sites and to extend them as proposed currently to deal with current and immediate demand, rather than opening up new gravel extraction sites.

[More details about Rep ID: 23116](#)

Representation ID: [23115](#)

SUPPORT Patricia Baseley

Summary:

Clearly in developing the Minerals Plan Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Officers have taken account of our concerns and recommendations [in relation to sand and gravel provision], accordingly we are happy with the Draft Proposals as written.

[More details about Rep ID: 23115](#)

Representation ID: [23112](#)

SUPPORT Mr RW Gill

Summary:

Clearly in developing the Minerals Plan Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Officers have taken account of our concerns and recommendations [in relation in sand and gravel provision], accordingly we are happy with the Draft Proposals as written.

[More details about Rep ID: 23112](#)

Representation ID: [23110](#)

SUPPORT North Yorkshire County Council (Mrs Joan Jackson)

Summary:

North Yorkshire County Council supports Policy MP2 because they would assist in maintaining supply of sand and gravel into markets also served by quarries in North Yorkshire and therefore help avoid the potential need for increased sand and gravel working in the North Yorkshire area, where there is already pressure on continued maintenance of supply.

[More details about Rep ID: 23110](#)

## [MP2: Sand and gravel provision, MP2o](#) [Coddington](#)

Representation ID: [23934](#)

SUPPORT Hanson Aggregates North (Mr Ben Ayres)

Summary:

Hanson supports the inclusion of the land at Coddington as a future sand and gravel site in the review of the Mineral Local Plan.

In line with the timeframes indicated in the delivery schedule set out in Appendix 2 of the Minerals Local plan documents, Hanson would prepare a planning application and environmental impact assessment which would seek to consider the potential impacts on the local amenity from the development and design within the scheme ways to mitigate those impacts.

As part of this process Hanson would carry out full consultation with the local community, statutory bodies and other interested parties in order to develop a scheme that has long term benefits to nature and the local community.

[More details about Rep ID: 23934](#)

Representation ID: [23730](#)

COMMENT Newark and Sherwood District Council (Matthew Tubb)

Summary:

The proposed allocation of Coddington is a key concern of the District Council and Councillor Mrs Dobson has questioned the overall appropriateness of the proposed allocation.

It is considered that the proposed access arrangements would significantly impact on the amenity of local residents. It is considered that a routeing agreement to avoid the stretch of Beckingham Road that runs through the village is necessary. Importantly for this site, the impact of growth on the A1/A46/A17 junctions has been highlighted as a particular issue in the transport evidence base for the District's Core Strategy and Allocations & Development Management DPDs , with junction improvements being identified in response.

The Transport Study for the Minerals Local Plan should not be carried out in isolation and should take account of the work already carried out as part of the Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework to establish the cumulative impact of committed and allocated development.

[More details about Rep ID: 23730](#)

Representation ID: [23516](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Celia Smallwood

Summary:

I strongly object to the proposed minerals plan as it is too close to the village and would have a detrimental effect on people living close by. The continual noise and dust pollution caused by increased traffic and the machinery working continually would be intolerable. It would have a devastating effect on wildlife and the neighbouring conservation area.

Change To Plan:

This proposed area should be removed from the plans because of the impact of the dangerous road conditions and the devastating impact on the environment.

[More details about Rep ID: 23516](#)

Representation ID: [23469](#)

**OBJECT** Fred Reed and 52 others

Summary:

We, the undersigned, object to the proposed minerals extraction quarry to the north-east of Coddington, which will have an unwelcome effect on the village, and the surrounding environment.

1. Location of site

Close to village centre (1/2 mile) and housing (1/4 mile)

2. Noise

a) Continual rumble from static machinery 24hrs, 7 days

b) High pitched beepers from loading equipment and HGVs will be a considerable irritant

c) High pitched beepers, from HGVs when reversing (NB. We can hear the Showground loudspeaker. With the proposed site being much closer to the village, the overall noise level will be unacceptable.)

3. Environment

a) Dust

b) Lowering of water table

4. General

Reduction in property values

[More details about Rep ID: 23469](#)

Representation ID: [23455](#)

COMMENT English Heritage (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge)

Summary:

There is high potential for the site to contain non-designated archaeology as noted by the SA. Development may also affect the setting of Coddington Conservation Area. The development brief does not refer to either issue, which is an omission.

[More details about Rep ID: 23455](#)

Representation ID: [23416](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Jackie Armstrong

Summary:

Concern about the size, scale and timescale of a quarry on a green-field site where large areas of water are alien to Coddington, and against landscape policies. Negative impacts of increased traffic flows through the Village, particularly on the closest properties with high proportions of elderly residents, and on noise, dust pollution, and pedestrian safety. The negative impact on house prices in Coddington and its desirability as a place to live, work or visit for the foreseeable future. Detrimental to the character of the neighbouring Conservation Area and its landscape context, to employment in adjacent businesses, and to designated SINC.

Change To Plan:

The proposed area should be removed from the plan due to the traffic impacts on a busy main road and nearby minor roads, and the detrimental impact on the neighbouring Conservation Area.

Southbound access onto Drove Lane off the A17 should be restricted to prevent large traffic volumes driving through the centre of the Village. This could be achieved either by gated access (for agricultural vehicles only) or by blocking off the access to / from Drove Lane south of the A17.

[More details about Rep ID: 23416](#)

Representation ID: [23414](#)

**OBJECT** Mrs Donna Payne

Summary:

I strongly object to the proposed plans to extract sand and gravel from the site at Coddington as it is too near my property and others and will have a detrimental effect on the quality of our lives.

It is inevitable that the development of a quarry will result in a depreciation of the value of properties and create an unacceptable increase in pollution and noise levels.

It will have a negative impact on congestion, increase traffic noise, encourage drivers to divert through the village to avoid delays.

There will be an unacceptable impact on the landscape and wildlife, especially woodland.

Change To Plan:

For the plan to be rejected

[More details about Rep ID: 23414](#)

Representation ID: [23413](#)

**COMMENT** Mr Graham Collyer

Summary:

I live close to the proposed extraction site. My main concerns are about the environmental impact. Inevitably there would be an increase in the volume of traffic. On the tonnage figures quoted this could involve an additional 200 vehicle movements daily travelling on

the A17 & A46 which are already very busy roads. In addition events at Newark Showground already cause congestion.

Air & noise pollution from extra traffic is inevitable, additionally blow away sand in dry windy weather in this open area could cause problems. Screen planting plans are inadequate on the east boundary of the site.

[More details about Rep ID: 23413](#)

Representation ID: [23379](#)

**OBJECT** Stuart Arkwell

Summary:

As a resident of Coddington for 34 years, I strongly object to the proposed plan to extract sand and gravel from the site at Coddington.

The additional traffic, noise and detriment to the visual amenity of our small village is both unwanted and unnecessary.

I fully support our Parish Council's objection to this plan, and would urge you to reject this application.

[More details about Rep ID: 23379](#)

Representation ID: [23378](#)

**OBJECT** Robert Reed

Summary:

I object to the Coddington site for the following reasons:

- Unbearable noise from plant and lorries disturbing near properties on Stapleford/Coddington Lane
- Dust impacting the village and Stapleford Lane
- Increase of heavy good vehicles. Stapleford Lane is unsuitable for HGVs
- Impacts on the landscape and wildlife/woodlands (including through the lowering of the water table)
- Possibility of landfilling after the sand and gravel extraction or if water-based recreation, it will generate noise traffic
- Possibility of future extensions
- I am told there is plenty of land approved in Nottinghamshire/Lincolnshire for the next 20 years.

[More details about Rep ID: 23378](#)

Representation ID: [23337](#)

**OBJECT** Coddington Parish Council (Mrs Yvette Wellard)

Summary:

These submissions set out why this allocation is unacceptable, namely:

a. Noise and disturbance to the residents of Coddington. Noise from activities at the Newark Showground, which lies to the north-west of the allocation, is already experienced in the

village. The allocation lies much nearer to the settlement.

b. Light and air pollution adversely affecting the village.

c. The potentially disastrous impact on Stapleford Woods.

d. Noise, disturbance, congestion and potential hazards arising from the use by HGVs of an inadequate road network.

Change To Plan:

For the reasons set out in this submission, Coddington Parish Council requests that the allocation at Coddington be deleted. If the County Council is minded to retain the allocation, the following constraints should be imposed:

a. Prior to the commencement of works on the site, modifications should be made to the A17/A46 and A17/A46/A1 junctions to increase their capacity and to make substantial improvements to their design. This should be complemented by the dualling of at least that section of the A17 eastwards from the Drove Lane junctions to the Stapleford Lane/C208 roundabout. The A46 dual carriage-way between Newark and Lincoln is commended for comparison. Movement to and from the Norton Disney sand and gravel quarry is at a generously constructed intersection (SK 4850 3598), whilst traffic from that at Swinderby joins the A46 at a roundabout.

b. The eastern boundary of the allocation should be moved to the west to give greater protection to Stapleford Woods, and substantial landscaping provided to screen the workings from the woods and to provide some noise attenuation.

c. Before any work is commenced on site, earth moulding and landscaping on a substantial scale be provided along the site frontages to the A17 and Drove Lane, to screen the development and to provide noise attenuation.

d. The processing plant should be relocated to the north-west corner of the site to reduce noise and disturbance to the residents of Coddington. An on-site service road would be required to link the plant to the A17 which would be the only means of vehicular access to the site.

e. An early environmental impact study should be undertaken to assess the potential effects of airborne dust on the residents and buildings of Coddington, and on traffic using the immediately adjacent A17.

f. No vehicular access to the site be permitted from Drove Lane or Stapleford Lane.

g. No working be permitted on-site during evenings and weekends, including all site access, HGV transport and machinery operations.

The permission would then require the restoration, after-use and after-care provisions referred to in Appendix 3.

[More details about Rep ID: 23337](#)

Representation ID: [23277](#)

COMMENT Environment Agency (Mr Andrew Pitts)

Summary:

The Environment Agency has no concerns regarding this allocation subject to the following mitigation measures being implemented:

As identified in the site Development Brief, a Flood Risk Assessment is required that confirms that there will be no storage of plant, equipment or storage of aggregate or overburden on the northern parts of this site that lie within flood zone 3. There are ordinary watercourses within the sites the flood risk assessment should also establish the potential flood risk from these sources and ensure that surface water runoff can be effectively managed on site, and does not lead to flood risk elsewhere.

Ground investigations and a watercourse inspection must be undertaken to ensure that the 9m easement from the minor watercourse is suitable enough to withstand an ingress of water from the watercourse into the quarry.

This potential site allocation is underlain by a Secondary Aquifer where groundwater is sensitive to pollution. Working of this site has the potential to cause pollution to the groundwater resource will require careful consideration and an environmental assessment.

[More details about Rep ID: 23277](#)

Representation ID: [23245](#)

COMMENT National Grid Plc represented by AMEC (Julian Austin)

Summary:

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

National Grid does not object to the proposals outlined, however the following points should be taken into consideration:

- National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and it obtains the rights from individual landowners to place our equipment on their land. Potential operators of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ because of the strategic nature of our national network. We advise developers and planning authorities to take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning a development.

- Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. These distances are outlined at the following webpage:

[http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohI\\_final/appendixIII/applIpart2](http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohI_final/appendixIII/applIpart2)

Should any of these sites be taken forward as a minerals site within these areas, the operators should be made aware of the above issues.

[More details about Rep ID: 23245](#)

Representation ID: [23220](#)

COMMENT Mrs Jeanne Allen

Summary:

I have no objection to the proposed extraction of gravel on the site near our home and business on the strict understanding that whoever extracts the gravel will have to take measures to minimise disruption to our lives, e.g. landscaping, working hours, traffic management, noise, dust, etc.

[More details about Rep ID: 23220](#)

Representation ID: [23194](#)

**OBJECT** Mr KB Tomlinson

Summary:

The proposed site in Coddington is totally inappropriate for several reasons:

1. It is too near to my and several other properties with the associated noise, dust and increased traffic.
2. It is inevitable that such a nearby development will result in a depreciation of our property values.
3. I think that the choice of site is due to the small number of nearby residencies so as usual, it's easier to steamroller through such a proposal.
4. Earth movement, vibration, traffic and water drainage may contribute to possible subsidence in the surrounding area.
5. Local wildlife will inevitably suffer.
6. Stapleford Woods is a popular local amenity which people enjoy and such an eyesore on the landscape plus the environmental consequences would ruin another rural area.

[More details about Rep ID: 23194](#)

Representation ID: [23146](#)

**OBJECT** Mr JE Payne

Summary:

Our property is on the proposed boundary which we consider to be far too close and unsuitable. The detrimental effects of noise, pollution, lower water table and landscape change is not conducive to the natural beauty of Stapleford Woods and surrounding area and could have a detrimental effect on the wildlife/forests.

Embankments to shield the view of the quarry will obscure the view of the open countryside, leading to blighted views and making the property harder to sell.

The A17 gets congested at the round-a-bout at Stapleford Lane end and will be even worse if the quarry access has to have traffic lights/round-a-bout.

[More details about Rep ID: 23146](#)

--

## Site Information

Representation ID: [23828](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

A revised proposal for Shelford East is being put forward. The key features of the revised site are as follows:

- Reduced extraction area to minimise impact on the historic environment, habitats and Shelford Village.
- Reduction in reserves from 5.7mt to 3.48mt.
- Access to be via a short stretch of Main Road and thereafter directly onto the A6097 via improved junction.
- Improved restoration with emphasis on wetland habitat creation, grazing marsh and reinstating the historic landscape.
- New footpaths to give greater access to the river and links to Trent Valley Way.

Because of the changes put forward this significantly improves the outcome in the SA compared to the original site put forward.

Change To Plan:

The revised Shelford East proposal should be considered for inclusion in the plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 23828](#)

Representation ID: [23827](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

A revised scheme for Shelford West is being submitted. Key features include:

- Reduced extraction area to minimise impact on historic environment, habitats and Shelford Village. (reduction from 9.5mt - 6.5mt)
- Improved restoration with emphasis on wetland habitat.
- Removal of marina
- Improvements to Shelford Hill in particular to junction with Shelford Road.
- New Footpaths to give greater access to the river and links to Trent Valley Way.

Because of the changes put forward this significantly improves the outcome of the SA compared to the original scheme.

Change To Plan:

The revised Shelford West proposal should be considered for inclusion in the plan.

[More details about Rep ID: 23827](#)

Representation ID: [23810](#)

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

Summary:

We are concerned by discrepancies in the site information and how these are translated to Appendix 2: Delivery Schedule. There are also no lead in times for production commencing at sites and therefore some of the assumptions made are unrealistic (details supplied). It may not be possible to work all of the Langford South allocation and the Western Extension should therefore also be allocated in order to maintain production capacity at Langford. Home Farm provides a more sustainable option to Coddington. There is no clear justification within the Sustainability Appraisal for excluding these sites (alternative assessment supplied).

Change To Plan:

Allocate West Extension to existing site at Langford.

Allocate land at Home Farm instead of Coddington.

[More details about Rep ID: 23810](#)

Representation ID: [23672](#)

COMMENT Newark PAGE represented by SSA Planning (Steve Simms)

Summary:

Cromwell

The supporting text is confusing and needs to separate out the existing quarry, the permitted extension and the proposed allocation. There is an error in the supporting text (see 'Changes to Plan').

Change To Plan:

Change factual error:

'North-west' should be 'East'

Separate out reference to existing quarry, permitted extension and proposed allocation.

[More details about Rep ID: 23672](#)

## MP2o - Coddington

**Representation ID:** [23911](#)

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

**Summary:**

NWT strongly welcome the guidance within the restoration briefs on suitable habitat types, however the development brief for this site does not give primacy to biodiversity.

**Change To Plan:**

Amend development brief to focus primarily on biodiversity.

[More details about Rep ID: 23911](#)

**Representation ID:** [23731](#)

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

**Summary:**

With the proximity of the site to Stapleford Wood this offers the opportunity for the restoration scheme to increase access to the piece of green infrastructure.

Where possible trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders (lots on the site boundaries and the Moors Brat Drain SINC) should be sought to be retained and included within the proposed screening of the site. The augmentation of screening to the south of the site along the A17 and of the processing plant is supported and will assist in limiting the visual impact of the allocation from the road itself and from Coddington village.

The reference to protection of the SINC within the site and of the ancient woodland, Moor Brats and Stapleford Woods (also a SINC) which adjoin the site is welcomed. It is important that the impact on these areas is minimised and mitigated where necessary.

The priority of wetland open habitats as part of the restoration scheme may also provide flood risk alleviation benefits and so is supported.

**Change To Plan:**

Add reference to protection of trees with Tree Preservation Orders

[More details about Rep ID: 23731](#)

**Representation ID:** [23624](#)

**COMMENT** R.S.P.B. (Central Region) (Mr Colin Wilkinson)

**Summary:**

The RSPB supports the provision of new areas of heathland and acid grassland in its eastern appendage, as per the Trent Valley BOM.

[More details about Rep ID: 23624](#)

**Representation ID:** [23557](#)

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

**Summary:**

We object to the proposed allocation of Coddington on the grounds that;

Parts of the site fall within Flood Zone 3 and there is a high risk of flooding.

Extraction will have a negative impact on biodiversity and the landscape.

There will be a loss of high quality agricultural land.

Mineral working and HGV traffic will have a negative impact on surrounding settlements.

**Change To Plan:**

Remove Coddington as a proposed allocated site.

[More details about Rep ID: 23557](#)

**Representation ID: [23556](#)**

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

**Summary:**

We object to the proposed allocation of Coddington on the grounds that;

Parts of the site fall within Flood Zone 3 and there is a high risk of flooding.

Extraction will have a negative impact on biodiversity and the landscape.

There will be a loss of high quality agricultural land.

Mineral working and HGV traffic will have a negative impact on surrounding settlements.

**Change To Plan:**

Remove Coddington as a proposed allocation.

[More details about Rep ID: 23556](#)

**Representation ID: [23412](#)**

**OBJECT** Mr David Armstrong

**Summary:**

Negative impacts of increased traffic flows through the centre of the Village including safety of pedestrians. Negative impacts, particularly on the closest properties, of noise, dust and pollution. The impact on house prices in Coddington and its desirability as a place to live, work or visit for the foreseeable future. Detrimental to the character of the neighbouring Conservation Area, its landscape context, and to employment prospects in adjacent leisure businesses. Detrimental to important wildlife habitats designated as SINC.

**Change To Plan:**

The proposed area should be removed from the plan due to the traffic impacts on a busy main road and nearby minor roads, and the detrimental impact on the neighbouring Conservation Area.

If the area is included in the plan, it should be conditional on southbound access onto Drove Lane off the A17 should be restricted to prevent large traffic volumes driving through the centre of the Village. This could be achieved either by gated access (for agricultural vehicles only) or by blocking off the access to / from Drove Lane south of the A17.

[More details about Rep ID: 23412](#)

--

## Sustainability Appraisal

Representation ID: [23980](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO14:

The winning and working of sand and gravel would be undertaken to the highest standards such that there would be no impact upon human health and quality of life. It is accepted that there will be an impact but this will be mitigated and minimised in accordance with established guidelines, the site should be scored -1. The restoration of Home Farm would look to make improvements to the ROW network, in particular the Trent Valley Way long distance footpath. The long term should be scored +2.

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: -1

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23980](#)

Representation ID: [23979](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO9:

The development of Home Farm will release a similar tonnage to Coddington. Like Coddington Home Farm would be made available at a similar time in the Plan period. Home Farm should be scored positive in the short term (+1).

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: +1

[More details about Rep ID: 23979](#)

Representation ID: [23978](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO8:

At Home Farm, the highest quality soils would be stripped and stored to protect their integrity and be used in the restoration of half of the site back to agriculture. There would be no net loss in the amount BAMVAL. Given that the site is flooded on an annual basis the quality of the soils on site is diminished, the majority of the site is not BAMVAL. Home Farm should be considered slight negative in the short term (-1) and neutral in the long term (0).

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: -1

Long term: 0

[More details about Rep ID: 23978](#)

Representation ID: [23977](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO7:

Restoration scheme at Home Farm would return half of the land to agriculture with the remaining half for biodiversity improvements longer term positive (+2).

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23977](#)

Representation ID: [23976](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO6:

A suitable stand off would be implemented for the working of Home Farm so that there would not be any impact upon the integrity of the river bank. Working methods would be implemented to ensure no impact upon the flood capacity of the site. Home Farm should be scored as neutral. The restoration of Home Farm would ensure improvement to site drainage, and provide flood storage capacity and therefore can be considered positive in the long term. Home Farm should be scored +1.

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: 0

Long term: +1

[More details about Rep ID: 23976](#)

Representation ID: [23975](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO5:

The current landscape at Home Farm is assessed as being poor. The restoration of Home Farm would enable improvements both to biodiversity and landscape enhancement opportunities. The long term impact should be scored +2.

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: 0

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23975](#)

Representation ID: [23974](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO4:

Home Farm has some archaeological sensitivities, however, these are proposed to be excluded from the working area and preserved in situ. Other remains on site are evaluated as being of local significance only. A programme of archaeological investigation and recording would be undertaken, the short term effect at Home Farm would be neutral. The restoration of Home Farm will be reflective of historic landscape setting with improvements to biodiversity. The long term effect should be scored as +2.

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: 0

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23974](#)

Representation ID: [23973](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO3:

Home Farm is well located to the A616 and well located to serve markets closer to Nottingham. None of the allocated sites are as well placed. Home Farm should be scored +2 in the short term and certainly higher than Coddington. Coddington will be served by the A17 and HGVs will be required to cross the A1/A46 interchange, this is already a busy junction with capacity constraints during peak hours.

Change To Plan:

Home Farm -

Operational period: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23973](#)

Representation ID: [23972](#)

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

Summary:

Revised SA comparison of Coddington and Home Farm

SO2:

Coddington will have a very significant negative impact upon Moor Brats Drain SINC therefore should be scored -3.

Home Farm will restore half of the site to habitat creation and therefore should be considered as positive impact rather than slight positive in the longer term, +2

Change To Plan:

Coddington -

Operational period: -3

Home Farm -

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23972](#)

Representation ID: [23971](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO14:

Flooding. As explained above in response to the comments on objectives 6 and 7 there will be a very significant benefit to the residents of Shelford as a result of the proposed improvements to the food defences at an early stage in the development. This will result in a beneficial effect on the quality of life from an early stage in the operational period as well as for the long term. This aspect of the effect should be allocated an effect score of +3 during the operational period and in the long term.

Access to the countryside. Currently there is very little access to any of this countryside apart from the PROW to Stoke Ferry which will be diverted during the excavation of this part of the site. However there is the potential to give access to a riverside route which currently doesn't exist and this can be implemented at the beginning of the development as it will be located within the standoff from the river.

[More details about Rep ID: 23971](#)

Representation ID: [23970](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO8:

No further information is currently available but the present tendency to flood may lead to a reduction in the assessment of the agricultural value of the land.

[More details about Rep ID: 23970](#)

Representation ID: [23969](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO7:

The proposed development will significantly improve the adaptability of the village of Shelford to climate change. As explained under the comments for Objective 6 Shelford is not currently protected from a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change and there are no plans to provide protection to this level. A major advantage of the proposed development is that the village of Shelford will be more effectively protected from increased flooding as a result of climate change at an early stage in the proposed operational period. This aspect of the effect should be allocated an effect score of +3 during the operational period and in the long term.

The location of the site relative to Nottingham and the ability to be able to use barge transport should give this site +1 during the operational phase giving an overall total of +2.

In the long term the introduction of the large areas of wetland habitat to give flora and fauna resilience should be added to the benefit of the additional flood defences to give a score of +2.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +2

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23969](#)

Representation ID: [23968](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO6:

It is stated that the sites largely are in the River Trent Floodplain (Zone 3). This is to be expected for most river deposits of sand and gravel. It is acknowledged in the MLPPA that sand and gravel workings are considered water compatible developments which are appropriate in flood zone 3 '...provided that there is no net loss of floodplain storage, water flows are not impeded and flood risk is not increased elsewhere.' It can be seen from the restoration proposals that the sites will be restored to a combination of restoration to existing ground levels and to water-based restoration. As a result of these proposals there will be no overall net loss of floodplain storage and an overall gain in floodplain storage where the ground is restored to water-based afteruses. From a very early stage during the operation of the sites the partially excavated and excavated but unrestored mineral extraction areas will provide significant additional flood storage during flood events. The village of Shelford is protected by current defences however these are not sufficient to provide protection for a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change. At an early stage in the development of the sites the standard of the defences around Shelford will be improved in order to bring them up to the necessary standard to provide protection for a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change. Furthermore the flood defence improvements which have been and are being carried out in Nottingham upstream

of Shelford will result in an increase in flood levels at Shelford which will also be taken into account when designing the improved defences. Overall therefore there will be a very positive impact in the provision of additional floodplain storage and the protection of Shelford from the commencement of operations which will continue following restoration and should be allocated an effect score of +3 for both the operational and the long term periods.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +3

Long term: +3

[More details about Rep ID: 23968](#)

Representation ID: [23967](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO5:

In combination, the landscape, archaeological and ecological conservation and enhancement should lead to different scores against Objective 5 "Protect and enhance the quality and character of our townscape and landscape". See attached for full details.

In the NMLP SA, the scores are shown as -3 during the operational period and -3 in the long term. The possibility of conserving landscape features is dismissed as unlikely to be compatible with mineral extraction; this is broadly not true.

The scores in the NMLP SA, reflecting the moderate landscape condition, the coherent not unified landscape and the positive landscape, archaeological and ecological enhancements, should be -1 during the operational phase (although progressive restoration would take place) and +1 in the long term as there would be substantial gains/improvements.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: -1

Long term: +1

[More details about Rep ID: 23967](#)

Representation ID: [23966](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO4:

The standoffs from the SAM and listed buildings together with that for the village have been increased to reduce adverse impact to insignificant. Impact on East Bridgeford is not accepted due to intervening road, vegetation and topography. The restoration is now amended to provide less open water.

The revised proposals have recognised the presence and extent of the scheduled monument, and extraction will stand-off its boundary by 100m. This should ensure the physical preservation of any archaeological features that extend beyond its designated boundary, as well as protecting the setting of this cropmark site. Restoration to current ground levels for a distance of 200m from the scheduled boundary will protect its setting for the long-term.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: -1

Long term: 0

[More details about Rep ID: 23966](#)

Representation ID: [23965](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO3:

The site is well related to the large growth area of Nottingham and Rushcliffe. Barge transport into the city is feasible. Shelford Hill and its junction with Shelford Road can be improved because the land either side is in the same ownership as the site. A further increment is given for the ability to be able to deliver mineral by barge.

[More details about Rep ID: 23965](#)

Representation ID: [23964](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford East

SO2:

The extraction boundary has now been revised to exclude the grazing marsh and the Dyke. Water levels in these features can be maintained by good hydrological management.

The proposed restoration scheme focuses on a habitat matrix that includes open water, wetlands and grazing marsh to provide opportunities for a wide variety of potential biodiversity benefits. The inclusion of large areas of grazing marsh complement and link existing parcels of this habitat and in combination with the other proposed habitats creates a significant stepping stone for biodiversity in the landscape.

The proposed restoration scheme is therefore considered to have the potential to achieve a positive impact over the long-term and thus score up to +2 for this element of the assessment.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +1

Long term:+2

[More details about Rep ID: 23964](#)

Representation ID: [23963](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO14:

Flooding. As explained above in response to the comments on objectives 6 and 7 there will be a very significant benefit to the residents of Shelford as a result of the proposed improvements to the flood defences at an early stage in the development. This will result in a beneficial effect on the quality of life from an early stage in the operational period as well as for the long term. This aspect of the effect should be allocated an effect score of +3 during the operational period and in the long term. Access to the countryside. Currently there is very little access to any of this countryside apart from the PROW to Stoke Ferry which will be diverted during the excavation of this part of the site. However there is the potential to give access to a riverside route which currently doesn't exist and this can be implemented at the beginning of the development as it will be located within the standoff from the river.

[More details about Rep ID: 23963](#)

Representation ID: [23962](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO8:

No further information is currently available but the present tendency to flood may lead to a reduction in the assessment of the agricultural value of the land.

[More details about Rep ID: 23962](#)

Representation ID: [23961](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO7:

The proposed development will significantly improve the adaptability of the village of Shelford to climate change. As explained under the comments for Objective 6 Shelford is not currently protected from a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change and there are no plans to provide protection to this level. A major advantage of the proposed development is that the village of Shelford will be more effectively protected from increased flooding as a result of climate change at an early stage in the proposed operational period. This aspect of the effect should be allocated an effect score of +3 during the operational period and in the long term.

The location of the site relative to Nottingham and the ability to be able to use barge transport should give this site +1 during the operational phase giving an overall total of +2.

In the long term the introduction of the large areas of wetland habitat to give flora and fauna resilience should be added to the benefit of the additional flood defences to give a score of +2.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +2

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23961](#)

Representation ID: [23960](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO6:

It is stated that the sites largely are in the River Trent Floodplain (Zone 3). This is to be expected for most river deposits of sand and gravel. It is acknowledged in the MLPPA that sand and gravel workings are considered water compatible developments which are appropriate in flood zone 3 '...provided that there is no net loss of floodplain storage, water flows are not impeded and flood risk is not increased elsewhere.' It can be seen from the restoration proposals that the sites will be restored to a combination of restoration to existing ground levels and to water-based restoration. As a result of these proposals there will be no overall net loss of floodplain storage and an overall gain in floodplain storage where the ground is restored to water-based afteruses. From a very early stage during the operation of the sites the partially excavated and excavated but unrestored mineral extraction areas will provide significant additional flood storage during flood events. The village of Shelford is protected by current defences however these are not sufficient to provide protection for a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change. At an early stage in the development of the sites the standard of the defences around Shelford will be improved in order to bring them up to the necessary standard to provide protection for a 1 in 100 year flood event taking into account climate change. Furthermore the flood defence improvements which have been and are being carried out in Nottingham upstream of Shelford will result in an increase in flood levels at Shelford which will also be taken into account when designing the improved defences. Overall therefore there will be a very positive impact in the provision of additional floodplain storage and the protection of Shelford from the commencement of operations which will continue following restoration and should be allocated an effect score of +3 for both the operational and the long term periods.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +3

Long term: +3

[More details about Rep ID: 23960](#)

Representation ID: [23959](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO5:

In combination, the landscape, archaeological and ecological conservation and enhancement should lead to different scores against Objective 5 "Protect and enhance the quality and character of our townscape and landscape". See attached for much greater detail.

In the NMLP SA, the scores are shown as -2 during the operational period and -1 in the long term. The possibility of conserving landscape features is dismissed as unlikely to be compatible with mineral extraction; this is broadly not true.

The scores in the NMLP SA, reflecting the positive landscape, archaeological and ecological features, should be -1 during the operational phase (although progressive restoration would take place) and +2 in the long term as there would be very substantial gains/improvements.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: -1

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23959](#)

Representation ID: [23958](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO4:

The setting of the SAM and Shelford village conservation area have been protected with greater standoffs. Taking the 1609 map and overlaying it as a "best fit" onto the evolving cultural heritage map the "warrener's house" area and the isolated rabbit "warren" lie within the extraction area, but also within ploughed fields. No pronounced earthworks will therefore survive and evidence would be limited to features lower than the reach of the plough. This cannot be regarded as significant and a watching brief would be appropriate mitigation.

The 1609 map also shows the old course of the Trent. When the Trent was on this course is without further research impossible to say - a mill is shown on the old course so it presumably still carried some water.

The importance of this is that the land within the extraction area is basically all flood plain of the Trent, and would originally have been on the west bank. So extraction and restoration to wetland is just another cycle in the evolution of the area, and quite probably what it would have looked like for much of history.

The setting of the scheduled gun battery is now protected by the standoff there are some strong positives appearing. We now know the reason for the siting - to protect the approach from Stoke Ferry.

I have marked all these on the attached map together with the field boundaries shown in 1609 extraction area.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: -2

Long term: 0

[More details about Rep ID: 23958](#)

Representation ID: [23957](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO3:

The site is well related to the large growth area of Nottingham and Rushcliffe. Barge transport into the city is feasible. Shelford Hill and its junction with Shelford Road can be improved because the land either side is in the same ownership as the site. The +1 score is directly comparable with that given by the County for Shelford East using this route. A further increment is given for the ability to be able to deliver mineral by barge. No marina is now proposed so the negative long term score is removed.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: +1

Long term: 0

[More details about Rep ID: 23957](#)

Representation ID: [23956](#)

**OBJECT** Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Revised SA of Shelford West

SO2:

In light of the revised proposed extraction area for Shelford West and the enhanced restoration scheme, it is clear that the proposed mineral extraction operation at this site could secure significant biodiversity benefits, potentially of value at the borough or county level once complete, whilst also minimising the effects of the direct loss of existing biodiversity resources. Applying the NCC's assessment criteria outlined in the SA to the new proposals, I therefore consider that the revised scheme in respect of biodiversity would score no lower than -1 for the operational period, and a minimum of +2 for the long-term assessment.

The revised scheme provides for protection of existing SNICs and the only loss will be

hedgerows. Indirect impact on hydrology for the SINCs and UKBAP site has been assessed as The restoration has now been changed to biodiversity based with large areas of wetland.

Change To Plan:

Operational period: -1

Long term: +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23956](#)

Representation ID: [23955](#)

COMMENT Brett Aggregates Limited (Mr Richard Ford) represented by Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (Jennifer Owen)

Summary:

Site SA - Table 2.2 Decision making criteria

SO3:

Bullet points 1 and 2 have not been dealt with adequately. It is only possible to assess the ability of a site to reduce mineral miles once the distribution of the sites and their contribution together with that at sites already permitted is known. Then it is possible to provide an overview. This should form part of the final analysis when it may be necessary to allocate sites in areas which are deficient and in so doing the benefit of the reduction in mineral miles will offset other environmental impacts. Distance to markets and access to the highway network should be assessed separately.

SO5:

In making this assessment a rather broad brush approach has been taken and the Character Assessment used as a landscape designation tool.

SO6:

The impact of the extraction of mineral on flooding has been assessed on the basis of the flood zone in which the site is located with site in higher zones being downgraded. This is not the correct approach because mineral extraction is a water compatible development and can improve existing flood risk problems by providing additional capacity and bunding.

SO7, 9 and 11:

All the sites have been given the same score - the SOs should be removed.

SO10:

All the sites have been given the same score. The number of homes which HGVs from the site will pass in reaching markets should be assessed. In particular the sites north of Newark where the A133 passes through a number of villages should be downgraded.

SO14:

The ability of a site to improve public access and flood defences through restoration should be taken into account.

[More details about Rep ID: 23955](#)

Representation ID: [23954](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 14:

The boundary of the site at Flash Farm has been significantly reduced and moved further away from the settlement of Averham. Recognised research work undertaken by central government indicates that matters such as noise as dust can readily be controlled particularly when appropriate stand-offs are introduced. The critical zone in respect of dust is 100m and at Flash farm the settlements of Averham and Kelham are 500 to 650m respectively from the nearest site operations. At such distances noise can readily be controlled but in any event, screening mounds will be incorporated (primarily to minimise any potential visual impacts).

Accordingly the "score" should be no greater than -1 for this aspect of the protection of human health and quality of life.

[More details about Rep ID: 23954](#)

Representation ID: [23953](#)

SUPPORT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objectives 9-13:

Agree with original sustainable assessment score.

[More details about Rep ID: 23953](#)

Representation ID: [23952](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 8:

The assessment for Land Research (Annexure 6) confirms that less than 60% of the site constitutes Grade 2 and 3a land (i.e. best and most versatile)

The site will be worked sequentially, progressively restoring the land close to pre-development ground levels so only a proportion of the site will be out of productive agricultural use at any one time.

Soils will be stripped, stored and replaced using accepted practices to ensure the same or better ALC can readily be achieved post-restoration.

The score during the working phase should therefore be no greater than -1 and certainly neutral or even +1 post restoration.

[More details about Rep ID: 23952](#)

Representation ID: [23951](#)

SUPPORT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 7:

No comment and agree with the score 0

[More details about Rep ID: 23951](#)

Representation ID: [23950](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 6:

The Hafren Water assessment (Annexure 5) concludes there will be no adverse impacts during the working phase and highlighting that only a proportion of the site is identified as being within the flood plain.

The restoration will be designed to incorporate lowland wet grassland and will extend the floodplain thereby offering greater long term sustainable benefits.

It is therefore suggested that during the working phase the impact should be no more than "-1" whereas the long term gain should +2

[More details about Rep ID: 23950](#)

Representation ID: [23949](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 5:

The landscape appraisal undertaken by FPCR (Annexure 4) confirms the blandness of the site with numerous landscape detractors present (e.g. pylons on the site and Staythorpe power Station a prominent feature).

The site itself consists of fields sub-divided by post and wire fences. The scheme can be worked without removing a single section of hedgerow and therefore there are no landscape fabric features on site to be harmed.

The concept restoration scheme will introduce varied species hedgerows along with conservation grassland.

During working therefore it is suggested that a more reflective score would be no more than "-1" whereas the restoration should score positively (+2)

[More details about Rep ID: 23949](#)

Representation ID: [23948](#)

SUPPORT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 4:

Agree with -1 score

[More details about Rep ID: 23948](#)

Representation ID: [23947](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 3:

The appraisal undertaken by Nottinghamshire County Council confirms the site is well-related to the main highway network but then raises an issue about Kelham Bridge and to a lesser degree, Southwell. The A617 is extensively used by HGV's and although Kelham Bridge is not ideal its impact has been overstated. It is therefore suggested that the environmental score should at least be neutral (i.e. zero). All other road linked quarries appear to have scored at least a "+1".

[More details about Rep ID: 23947](#)

Representation ID: [23946](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 2:

There is now a clearly defined stand-off from the Kelham Hills SINC to the north-west of the site and the ecological appraisal (See Annexure 1) confirms as the woodland is on higher ground and based on different underlying geology with different hydraulic characteristics then there no envisaged adverse impacts.

Notwithstanding the increased stand-off distance, the woodland is not on the receiving alignment of the prevailing wind (which is from the south-west) and therefore indirect effects of noise and dust would be negligible. In any event the material when excavated is in a damp state and therefore dust is rarely a serious adverse issue.

In respect of the restoration, it is proposed that lowland neutral and wet grassland will be established across the site with additional lengths of species rich hedgerows. The grasslands and hedgerows are high priority habitats identified within the Nottinghamshire Bio-diversity Action Plan.

Accordingly it is suggested that the "effect" during the operational phase will be neutral (or zero score) whilst the long-term effect is positive and it is suggested this should score at least +2 for the potential contribution to BAP priority habitats

[More details about Rep ID: 23946](#)

Representation ID: [23945](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Revised SA of Flash Farm

Sustainability Objective 1:

Although the revised scheme will generate a smaller tonnage, the estimated figure of 3.08 million tonnes nevertheless will make a large contribution to aggregate supply and therefore the original "score" would still be relevant

[More details about Rep ID: 23945](#)

Representation ID: [23944](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

It is evident that the SA discussion of Flash Farm is heavily influenced by the absence of information, which has now been supplied, and accordingly a precautionary approach has been taken which has downgraded the site. However, MGL's reassessment of this site puts it back among the leading contenders as a site without strategic value. As such, it easily scores above more favoured sites. A detailed consideration of each of the objectives in relation to Flash Farm is set out in separate comments.

[More details about Rep ID: 23944](#)

Representation ID: [23943](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Criterion 9 - efficient use of resources - also gives preference for extensions over new sites or favours large sites over smaller ones. Whilst it is a general observation that mineral that can be worked acceptably should not be left in the ground, the SA appears to have been presented on the basis of an assumption that that is always the case, when as MP1 Practice Guide observes, that is not always the case, and sites need to be treated on their merits at a suitable level of detail.

[More details about Rep ID: 23943](#)

Representation ID: [23942](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Criterion 5 - landscape - all sites are given negative scores in operation even where the process is necessary to achieve landscape improvement. Again, the scores are influenced by the LCA for the Trent Washlands in most cases and judgments are made about specific sites and locations often within large landscape tracts which must by their nature contain a lot of variability. Therefore, the scoring process seems overly influenced by landscape tract policy assumptions rather than an appraisal of the effects of working at a specific location.

[More details about Rep ID: 23942](#)

Representation ID: [23941](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Criterion 3 - sustainable transport - one site scores positively because it proposes barge transport. However, all of the rest propose road transport but are not accorded the same scores. This is because an assumption is made about the desirability of extensions and their acceptability regardless of their specific performance, whilst a new site is automatically downgraded by 2 points because it is a new access, regardless of whether an access can be gained acceptably with minimal engineering work as required at Flash Farm. The scores thus give a wrong impression that there is more difference between the sites than there is in reality.

[More details about Rep ID: 23941](#)

Representation ID: [23940](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Criterion 2 - biodiversity - the scores do not seem to reflect the AMES results. Moreover, when compared with criterion 8 - protection of BMV land - if sites contain BMV land, as most do, scores cancel each other out leading to the impression that there is no sustainability gains from mineral working because BMV land is turned into wetland biodiversity. The opposition of biodiversity over BMV land is a purely policy preference and not a necessary consequence of mineral working. This is surely counter intuitive and is misleading. It also does not give sufficient credit to schemes like Flash Farm which are able to both preserve BMV land and offer biodiversity gain.

Because the scoring technique is numerical, the practice of scoring certain criteria with a question mark due to lack of information or where the compiler cannot say whether an effect is good or bad, gives a misleading impression of the sustainability of any particular site. It effectively means that no information tends to be a benefit when looking at comparisons between sites, which is unhelpful in the process of site selection.

[More details about Rep ID: 23940](#)

Representation ID: [23939](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

Criterion 1 - Mineral Demand - the sites are scored according to their contribution to demand meaning that larger sites score better than smaller ones. However, this is not balanced in other parts of the SA by the observation that the larger the site the greater will be the degree of environmental disturbance.

[More details about Rep ID: 23939](#)

Representation ID: [23938](#)

**OBJECT** Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

MGL believes the SA process to be flawed by making wide assumptions about effects and not giving sufficient attention to the likely effects of mineral working at each site, by an unreasonable assumption that large sites are better than smaller ones, by a similar assumption that extensions are better than new workings, by favouring a lack of information about effects, and by inadvertently cancelling sustainability gains in biodiversity against loss of BMV land, when that is encouraged by policy. These are set out in detail in individual comments.

On balance, MGL believes the AMES study gives a much better result of the sustainability of the site options and the SA needs to be substantially modified in the light of the critique here presented to align the two methods of analysis.

Change To Plan:

The AMES study should be used as an alternative indicator of sustainability and the SA should be substantially modified to reflect this.

[More details about Rep ID: 23938](#)

Representation ID: [23937](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

For those sites in the study area, the result of the Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity study does not seem to have been reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (see attachment for table detailing this - Flash Farm is in the Pale Pink area, but has a very low combined SA score in comparison to other sites in Pink, Red and Dark Red categories).

[More details about Rep ID: 23937](#)

Representation ID: [23935](#)

COMMENT Mick George (Mr John Gough)

Summary:

For those sites in the study area, the result of the Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity study does not seem to have been reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (see attachment for table detailing this - Flash Farm is in the Pale Pink area, but has a very low combined SA score in comparison to other sites in Pink, Red and Dark Red categories).

[More details about Rep ID: 23935](#)