

DERBYSHIRE AND DERBY MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

Towards a Minerals Local Plan: Spring 2018 Consultation

REPORT OF PUBLICITY AND SUMMARY OF RESPONSES 2012-2017

DECEMBER 2017

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Consultation methods used
3. Summary of Responses – Sand and Gravel Sites Consultation, 2012
4. Summary of Responses – Rolling Consultation, 2015-2016
5. Summary of Responses – Hard Rock Sites Consultation, 2016-2017

1. Introduction

This report sets out the consultations that have been undertaken on the emerging Minerals Local Plan since the publication of the Issues and Options Report. This included the sand and gravel sites consultation in 2012, a rolling consultation during 2015 and 2016 and a further consultation on hard rock sites in late 2016/early 2017.

The Rolling Consultation began in April 2015. A number of strategy and related supporting papers were published initially, which set out the emerging approach for various elements of the Minerals Local Plan. These were added to during late 2015 and early 2016 and responses continued to be invited on all papers until 3 July 2016.

The Hard Rock Sites Consultation ran for an initial six week period from December 2016 to January 2017 but as a result of significant public interest, it was agreed to extend this for a further six week period to 28 February 2017.

This report provides a summary of the methods used in the consultations and a brief summary of the number and key issues that were raised in the responses to these consultations.

A more detailed summary of the representations made so far, together with a considered response and proposed outcome for the Spring 2018 Consultation: Proposed Approach can be found in the following document:

Towards a Minerals Local Plan: Spring 2018 Consultation: Report of Representations, December 2017

2. Consultation Methods used

The following methods were used by the authorities to publicise the consultations:

1. Direct Mail Letters and emails to individual and organisations with a declared interest in minerals planning
2. Latest News articles on the councils' websites
3. Newspaper articles
4. Public displays in libraries
5. Posters/Flyers
6. Community Forums
7. Social media
8. Drop-in sessions

Direct Mail – Letters & Email Invitations to organisations with a declared interest in Minerals Planning

The authorities sent out a total of 550 postal letters for each consultation, comprising;

- A letter to 87 interest groups
- A letter to 42 businesses
- A letter to 55 adjoining parish councils
- A letter to 212 Derbyshire parish councils
- A letter to 122 individuals
- A letter to 32 Government agencies, other agencies, trade groups & utilities

The authorities also sent out an email to 264 organisations and individuals.

Latest News

The authorities ensured that their web pages were updated with the latest information regarding the consultation.

Newspaper Articles

Articles were published about the Minerals Local Plan in various local newspapers throughout the consultation periods.

Posters

Posters were sent out with the letters to Parish Councils. The letter asked for the poster to be placed on the parish notice board.

Posters were also fixed to lamp posts around the sites that were included in the hard rock sites consultation.

Public Displays

Arrangements were made to place the documents on display in all Derby & Derbyshire libraries, all mobile libraries and in district council offices.

Community Forums & Local Area Forums

An email was sent to the district council community forum asking them to make their members aware of the consultations and to distribute the documents.

An email was also sent to the organiser of the Local Area Forums.

Social Media

A message was placed on the Derbyshire County Council Twitter Page informing people of the beginning of the consultation. Derbyshire County Council page has 1,239 followers.

Drop-in Sessions

Nine drop-in sessions were held during the sand and gravel sites consultation in 2012. Five drop-in sessions were held in 2017 to provide an opportunity for local people to discuss the proposals for hard rock sites with council officers.

3. Summary of Responses – Sand and Gravel Sites Consultation 2012

Broadly, the sessions were designed to explain to people what the Minerals Local Plan is and how it may affect them, in terms of the Strategy for future sand and gravel working in Derby and Derbyshire, and for people to tell us what they thought. This took place in the form of informal discussions with members of staff. We provided background information and a structured questionnaire to aid the discussions.

Specifically, we asked people:

- 1) If they agreed with the amount of sand and gravel that should be provided from Derbyshire to 2030. If not, how much they thought should be provided.
- 2) Where, in broad terms, future extraction should take place.
- 3) Whether they had any further sites to put forward.
- 4) If they agreed with our draft criteria for assessing the sites and if they could think of any further criteria.
- 5) What community benefits/opportunities they thought could arise from sand and gravel working.
- 6) Whether they agreed with the strategic long term Vision for the restoration of sites in the Trent Valley.

We made of note of what people said and a summary of these is provided below. We also encouraged people (particularly those who were unable to attend) to write to us or complete an online form with their comments.

Foston & Scropton Parish Hall, 24 September 2012

41 people attended.

People in general were concerned about the impact of a new quarry on the area, which has so far experienced no significant mineral extraction. There was, as expected, a degree of concern amongst local residents, but this was reduced to some extent once the details of the plan and the long term nature of the strategy had been explained.

The issue of how a new quarry would affect flooding in an area already highly susceptible to flooding was a major concern. The EA are soon to begin a major flood defence scheme in the area and the southern field suggested for extraction is proposed in the EA scheme as a floodwater holding area. It was considered by residents that the two proposals would be incompatible.

People were also concerned about where the access to the quarry would be and whether HGVs would go through the villages. Noise was also raised as a concern.

The cumulative impact of another industry operating in a rural area already the focus of major employers, such as Cranberry Foods and the proposed pig farm was raised as an issue. It was suggested that increasingly there seems to be more employment than people living in the area. Again, the issue of traffic passing through the village was raised in this respect.

In general, people supported the development of a longer term strategy for the restoration of the valleys.

Barrow on Trent Village Hall, 26 September 2012

17 people attended.

The issue of cumulative impact of Swarkestone Quarry on the area was raised by a small number of people but most people living in Barrow, in general, accept the quarry, which seems to be operated with respect to the community and have expected that it will extend towards Twyford in time. The fact that this suggested extension means that it is moving gradually away from Barrow also helps to reduce concern.

People who are most concerned are those living in the properties along Twyford Road to the north of the suggested site. Loss of views, impact on property values, increased risk of flooding (Barrow has no new flood defences), traffic impact on unsuitable local roads and effect on the abundant wildlife were all issues that were raised by these residents. Some people raised the issue of cumulative impact on the area, and thought that after the current permitted area is worked, it should then be allowed to recover without further working taking place.

The main issue raised by residents of Barrow village was the impact that continued quarry traffic, together with that from the redeveloped power station, will have on the junction of the A5132 with the A514. People considered that a major community benefit from the continued operation of the quarry would be the improvement of this junction.

The environmental sensitivity mapping project being undertaken by the council's Landscape Team was well received and helped people to understand the proposed long term restoration strategy for the Trent Valley.

Weston on Trent Village Hall, 28 September 2012

39 people attended.

Given the fact that there is a planning application on the site, people were a lot more focused on details of the proposal rather than the longer term strategy for sand and gravel extraction in the valley as a whole. Again, most people accepted the need for sand and gravel and that it can only be extracted where it is found and had to some degree expected Shardlow Quarry to eventually extend in this direction. However, the fact it will be much closer to the village than the existing quarry was a concern.

Again, it became clear that, in general, the operator works well with the community and responds to their concerns. It seems that Donington Park and the Airport produce a lot more noise and disturbance than the quarry.

Most expressed concern about where the access would be and whether lorries would travel through Weston. Impact on views, flooding, loss of wildlife and informal recreation were also concerns. People asked for screening on the north side of the site.

The potential impact on Kings Mill Lane was also raised by a significant number of people. It was considered generally that the provision of a bridge across the river from Kings Mill Lane would be a good community benefit resulting from the working of the quarry. The improvement of the canal towpath in the area was also raised in this respect, as were improved community facilities such as buses and shops.

There was overall support for the proposed strategy for the restoration of the Trent Valley area.

Repton Village Hall, 4 October 2012

Over 150 people attended.

There was general concern expressed by the majority of local people over the potential impact that the development of this site could have. The size of the site surprised many.

Most thought that the area of the valley between Repton and Willington is totally unsuitable for aggregate extraction. It was considered that it would have a number of adverse impacts, including increased noise, increased traffic on already unsuitable roads, increased risk of flooding, dust, loss of views across the valley, loss of important historic artefacts and environment and the potential impact on the setting of Repton and Willington and its proximity to built up areas.

Many people asked where the access is proposed, and were to some extent relieved that Hansons planned to access the site from Twyford Road with a new river bridge. There was still concern then that lorries would travel through an already congested Willington.

Overall, it was felt that the site was too sensitive in a number of respects and that other sites that have been suggested which are further from communities offer greater potential for mineral extraction.

The main benefit that local people would like to see arise from any future extraction would be a new bridge connecting Repton and Willington to help relieve traffic congestion in the area.

No specific comments were raised about the suggested extension to the Willington Quarry.

People were keen to learn about the longer term strategy for the restoration of the Trent Valley area.

Elvaston Village Hall, 5 October 2012

25 people attended.

The main concerns raised included the potential impact of access arrangements and additional traffic on the local roads, the impacts of noise and dust on local villages and whether the proposal would increase flood risk. The proximity of the site to Elvaston Castle was also raised.

People also commented on the extent to which this area has suffered from the effects of quarrying in the past, some people thought it would be better if the resource was removed so that they could then be left alone, whilst others thought that it should now be the turn of other areas to bear the burden of mineral extraction.

Several people mentioned the poor quality of the deposits in this area and suggested that if sand and gravel extraction was necessary, it should be in an area where the yield would be greater for the amount of land lost.

In terms of restoration, people questioned whether it should be returned to an agricultural end use, or left as an open body of water.

Egginton Village Hall, 18 October 2012

52 people attended.

Main concerns raised included the potential impact that extraction may have on flooding in the area, particularly the impact on the water table during extraction.

Local people also discussed with us a long awaited flood alleviation scheme, which is due to start next year and includes the land suggested for extraction. Locals do not want this important scheme to be compromised by sand and gravel extraction.

People were also concerned that quarry traffic would go through the village. It is likely however that access would be to the north through the Airfield. Hansons own the track.

The cumulative impact on the area was also raised by a number of people in terms of the recent development in the area (A50, Nestle, the proposed rail interchange, housing) and yet another proposal would be unwelcome. People were concerned about the loss of the footpaths through the site and the impact on important historic landforms (ox bow lakes and ridge and furrow) and on wildlife.

The proximity of Derby Airfield is also of major concern. The threat of bird strike is already a concern but it is considered that an increase in water bodies would increase this risk to unacceptable levels.

The construction of the new gas pipeline through part of the site was raised. Concern was expressed over how this would be protected.

The proposed restoration strategy was well received and people hoped it would be developed further.

Long Eaton Library, 8 November 2012

19 people attended.

People were concerned about the proximity of the extension of the Attenborough Quarry to housing and the potential effect that dust, noise and traffic would have on them. Fears were somewhat allayed when they were told that the material would be transported through the site to the existing processing plant at Attenborough.

The impact on house prices and insurance premiums was also raised; some insurance companies consider that sand and gravel quarries increase the risk of flooding.

Residents were worried that the workings could increase the risk of flooding by disrupting the water table.

Generally, people who had lived in the area for a while accepted the workings but newer residents were more concerned.

Some people supported the proposal and put forward benefits they hoped the development may bring to the area, such as more informal recreation opportunities and improvements to highway maintenance.

Most people were more concerned about the specific impacts of the site than the overall strategy, which they said should be left to us to develop.

Generally people would prefer to see the site restored to agriculture rather than another area of water. They were assured to learn that only inert fill could be used and it would not become a landfill site.

Shardlow Village Hall, 22 November 2012

42 people attended.

Many people were not aware that the Chapel Farm site is allocated in the current Minerals Plan and that there is a planning application on it. Those who are were concerned that this latest consultation process means that the extraction is now more likely to proceed.

People were concerned about whether there would be increased heavy quarry traffic passing through the villages, but were relieved to learn that the mineral is proposed to be moved by barge to the former Hemington Quarry.

There was also concern about the increased risk of flooding. People imagine a void full of water and see this as posing an increased flood risk.

Many people were concerned that the existing rights of way through the site, which local people consider a real community asset, will be destroyed and not replaced if extraction goes ahead.

Generally, people could not see any community benefits arising from extraction here. It seems that most have had enough with extraction taking place close by in recent years at Hemington, Shardlow and Elvaston quarries. They think that other communities should now take their share.

Most people thought that the apportionment figure in the Local Aggregate Assessment should be revised downwards to take greater account of the economic conditions.

People were more concerned about the proposals for the site rather so the proposed restoration strategy was not considered to any great extent here.

Sudbury Parish Room, 13 December 2012

17 people attended.

People were concerned about the impact of the sites, particularly the eastern site, on the character of the village, particularly given that it is a conservation area.

Heavy traffic passing through the village was a major concern, as was the potential for bottlenecks forming at the A50 roundabout if the eastern site near Sudbury was worked. Related to this was the question of where the access to each site would be located.

People also asked where the processing plants would be located and how much noise these would be likely to generate and whether this would be monitored by the Council.

Many asked how much sand and gravel there was in the sites and long extraction would last.

The potential for noise, dust and mud on the road were all discussed.

People asked whether Leathersley Lane would remain open or if this was to be removed as part of the scheme.

People generally wanted the site restored back to agricultural use and could see the benefits of the proposed restoration strategy for the river valleys.

A number of people questioned whether it was likely that the site could be delivered in the plan period to 2030, given that production at existing sites has slowed down.

There was no overall consensus on the question in the overall strategy as to whether extraction should take place in this area of the Dove Valley or whether it should continue in the Trent Valley. Some accepted that sand and gravel is a resource that has to be used and expected extraction to take place

at some point, while others thought the area should be protected from extraction, given the conservation value of the area.

4. Summary of Responses – Rolling Consultation

59 people and organisations provided a total of 358 comments. 14 of these people/organisations also completed various parts of the on line questionnaire.

The summaries of the written and questionnaire responses below are by topic, as set out in the consultation.

Spatial Portrait (Supporting Paper)

There were 4 comments made by 3 respondents to this part of the Plan.

- Two asked for more general background information on the Derbyshire minerals industry to be included in the Plan.
- One asked for reference to be made to the National Forest.
- One asked for a sentence to be included stating that the stunning landscapes coincide with the existence if minerals.

Vision and Objectives (Supporting Paper)

13 comments were received from 4 individuals/organisations.

- All of these provide advice on the content of the vision and objectives, according to the respondents' area of expertise.

Strategic Sustainability Principles

Written Responses

There were 33 comments on this paper from eight individuals and organisations.

- Eight of these comments support the policies as drafted.
- Policy SMP1 should emphasise the potential for restored sites to provide environmental enhancement and should place equal emphasis on all sustainability principles not just economic.

- Policy SMP2 is too inflexible. It should provide exceptions/qualifications. It should also provide greater detail on causes of climate change
- Policy SMP3 should distinguish between levels of environmental designation and make reference to the historic environment. It should also be more explicit about the use of recycled aggregates.
- Policy SMP4 is considered too inflexible regarding recycled aggregates.
- The others offer various amounts of advice and suggestions as to how the policies should be reworded or provide additional/revised wording according to the respondents' area of interest.

Transport

There has been 1 response from 1 respondent to this strategy paper.

- Support for the proposed policy approach but with a request for greater clarity regarding the type of information that would be required relating to mineral resources and markets.

Aggregate Crushed Rock

Written Responses

There were 16 comments on this paper from 10 individuals/organisations.

These are the main issues that have been raised:

- There is general agreement that new proposals for crushed rock should be restricted, other than in exceptional circumstances of public benefit.
- Opinion is divided as to whether operators should be asked to relinquish reserves in return for new proposals.
- One comment expresses concern that the landbank of over 100 years is misleading since end dates of most permissions are around 2042, so the certain landbank is only considered to be 27 years.
- Concern is also expressed that the text is weighted too much towards economic need rather than giving full consideration to the range of sustainability principles and that greater emphasis should be placed on protection of the environment, both natural and historic.
- One operator argues that any policy should be flexible enough to allow for extensions to existing sites and disagrees that these should only be modest sites that do not increase the landbank significantly.
- Others argue that, because of the large landbank, extensions or new sites should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
- One operator objects to a policy requirement that local benefits should be provided in order to make a proposal acceptable, stating that there are environmental benefits from extensions in any case.

- One comment calls for increased transport of aggregate by rail rather than road. Revised and/or additional wording is offered or suggested to address these concerns.
- Other MPAs support the approach of Derbyshire maintaining supplies to other parts of the country.

Questionnaire Responses

There were two responses to the questionnaire which supported Option 2 (To not permit any new proposals for crushed rock).

Helping to Reduce Quarrying in the Peak District National Park

Written Responses

There have been 11 responses to this paper from 6 respondents.

- Whilst most support the overall aim of helping to reduce in quarrying of aggregate in the Peak Park over time, this is tempered by concerns relating to whether this would lead to a significant increase in quarrying in Derbyshire and the resulting environmental and social impacts.
- One particular area of concern is around Rowsley, where it is feared new quarries would open/re-open to compensate for those closing in the adjoining Peak Park.
- One comment sets out that the mpa must have evidence that the resources are interchangeable; if there are unique resources in the Peak Park this should be addressed.
- One comment suggests that the policy should also cover building stone not just aggregates and therefore that Derbyshire should increase its supply of building stone.
- Amendments and additions to wording to this policy are also suggested.

Questionnaire Responses

There have been 4 responses to the questionnaire; 1 supported the proposed approach and three were unsure.

Sand & Gravel

Written Responses

8 individuals or organisations responded and together made a total of 8 comments to this paper.

- Two of these question the method by which the provision figures have been calculated, suggesting that the figure should be higher, using the previous SRA figure until a robust forecast methodology has been developed and to include an element of flexibility. Concerned, therefore, about under provision over the course of the Plan period.
- Equally, support is expressed for the provision figure.

- The Plan should indicate that production can be maintained at more than 1mtpa.
- One comment of support is expressed for the proposal to favour extensions to existing sites over new ones.
- Concern is expressed for opening up sites in the Lower Dove Valley and also around Repton where the road network would not be considered suitable for heavy lorries.

Questionnaire Responses

Three individuals completed the on line questionnaire, responses being split equally between supporting and not supporting the emerging approach and being unsure.

Sand and Gravel Site Assessment Methodology (Supporting Paper)

10 comments have been received to the site assessment methodology from 5 organisations.

- One states that preference should be given to extensions
- One states that there should be no new sites allocated
- Modifications should be made to the scoring system
- The quality of the resource should be included as a criteria
- Concern is expressed over consideration of cross border environmental assets.
- The assessments should include a criteria to consider the loss of sports facilities.
- Soil surveys should be undertaken to determine the quality of the soil.
- One expresses support for the exclusion of low scoring sites

Sand and Gravel Site Assessments (Supporting Paper)

21 comments have been received from 10 respondents.

- 1 operator supports the allocations at Swarkestone and Elvaston but suggests their potential for working should be regraded to medium/high.
- 3 individuals and 1 organisation object to the allocation at Swarkestone South
- 1 objects to an allocation at Egginton
- There are 3 comments about Chapel Farm (Site now withdrawn for consideration)
- 1 organisation objects to the proposed allocation at Repton/Foremark
- Staffs CC provide a comment on the ecological value of the Willington site.
- Historic England is concerned about the approach to *Historic Environment - Designated Sites and Settings* sections and how the setting of assets outside the site boundary has been considered. Concerns raised in this respect about Swarkestone, Elvaston, Foston and Repton

- The rest offer suggestions for how the sites should be worked and restored should the allocations proceed

Trent Valley Strategy and Methodology

Written Responses

There have been 24 comments from 11 individuals or organisations to this part of the Plan. (4 of these are to the methodology paper)

- Four support the proposed approach.
- Three express concern that the Environmental Sensitivity Mapping excludes national environmental designations from its analysis.
- One asks for the strategy to coordinate with the Central Rivers Initiative for the Trent and Tame Valleys.
- The RSPB document “Bigger and Better” should be taken into account in the Strategy.
- It should be coordinated with the CRI strategy so that it links with neighbouring areas.
- More general comments relate to wording and the consistency of the strategy with the sand and gravel strategy.

Questionnaire Responses

Eight people completed the questionnaire for this part of the Plan. Seven of these supported the proposed approach and one was unsure.

Four responses were received to the question of whether the sensitivity work should inform the site selection methodology for sand and gravel sites. One agreed, two did not and one was unsure.

Industrial Limestone

Written Responses

There have been 39 comments submitted by 9 individuals/organisations.

- The three operators that proposed extensions to their quarries at Whitwell, Ashwood Dale and Brassington Moor supported their allocation in the Plan.
- One respondent supported the recognition that industrial minerals are scarce resources in need of safeguarding from unnecessary sterilisation from non-mineral development.
- One respondent supported the requirement to maximise the use of industrial limestone for those purposes and acceptance that where limestone cannot be used for industrial purposes it can be used for construction purposes.
- One respondent supported the recognition of the resource at Whitwell as being nationally important.
- One respondent supported the Duty to Co-operate working taking place on issues at Whitwell Quarry.
- One respondent was concerned about the proposed extensions to Whitwell Quarry in relation to the need to protect Creswell Crags from

future mineral working especially in view of its potential for World Heritage status.

- One respondent stressed the importance of taking into account the impact of mineral extraction on historic and other environmental assets both in any emerging policies and in the assessment of any proposed allocations.
- One respondent thought it was misleading to refer to the level of permitted industrial limestone reserves within the whole Plan area and suggested that the level of reserves at individual active quarries should be included in the Plan.
- One respondent argued it was misleading to use the term 'landbanks' when referring to industrial limestone reserves; the phrase 'stock of permitted reserves' should be used as per the NPPF.
- Amendments and additions to wording are also suggested.

Questionnaire Responses

- There have been 6 responses to Issue 1 about the way in which the Plan should make provision for the future supply of industrial limestone; 4 supported Option 3 which was to make provision through existing permitted reserves, allocations and a criteria based policy, 1 supported the Option 2 which was to rely on existing permitted reserves and a criteria based policy only and 1 supported Option 1 to only make provision through existing reserves and allocations.
- There were 4 responses to Issue 2; which was about the components of a criteria based policy. One suggested that the policy should include environmental protection including heritage. One agreed that it was reasonable for the need to work that particular mineral to require justification; two suggested it was too onerous to require both justification of need and maximisation of recovery to meet that need.
- There were 9 responses to Issue 3; two required the heritage impacts of the suggested sites for working to be properly taken into account. Particular mention was made of the need to protect Creswell Crags from any future working. Three respondents supported specific allocations that had been put forward. One respondent questioned the need for any allocations in view of the current level of permitted reserves.
- There were three responses to Issue 4; there was general consent for the requirement for sufficient evidence to be submitted in support of any proposed site to enable a proper evaluation of the site to take place in relation to its need, deliverability and impacts on the environment and communities.
- There were four responses to Issue 5; both supported the approach of a separate policy for the supply of raw materials for cement production. One added the need to include environmental criteria in any policy.

Hard Rock Quarries Potential Allocations Site Assessment

Methodology

(Supporting Paper)

- There have been 3 responses from 1 respondent about the Site Assessment Criteria used relating to the weighting of criteria, potential mitigation measures and the thresholds chosen for several criteria e.g. noise and dust.

Building Stone

Written Responses

There have been 12 comments from 5 individuals or organisations.

- Two of these comments support the approach proposed.
- One disagrees with the assumption made that future need for building stone is impossible to predict.
- One considers the proposed approach too restrictive in terms of the level of production that would be permitted and in terms of the sale of aggregate from sites as a by-product.
- One suggests that the policy should recognise that the market for building stone changes over time and that it should encompass the whole of the UK.
- One suggests that the policy should recognise that building stone is required for uses other than maintaining character of buildings and settlements.
- One suggests that the policy should coordinate with that for reducing quarrying in the Peak Park.
- One suggests that the resources map should indicate the presence of building stone resources around Hardwick Hall.
- A site at Bent Lane, Darley Dale, is put forward as a proposed allocation.

Questionnaire Responses

3 people completed the questionnaire relating to building stone. Two of these express support for the approach proposed of making future provision through a criteria policy rather than allocations, and one does not.

Seven comments were also made on the building stone supporting paper by one respondent. These relate to interpretation of national policy, the often high percentage of reject stone which could be used as aggregate, the fact that stone can be transported beyond the local area for processing and the interpretation of what national policy means by “small scale” and therefore whether the policy should stipulate that building stone quarries should be small scale.

Safeguarding Mineral Resources

Written Responses

There have been 36 responses to this paper from 13 individuals or organisations.

- There is overall support for the approach as proposed and for the minerals which are proposed to be safeguarded.
- One comment suggests that the high grade industrial element of the Permian Limestone should be safeguarded separately to distinguish them from the aggregate grade mineral.
- Three consider that safeguarding of building stone should not be as restrictive and it should cover all the resource. One of these refers also to clays and Sherwood sandstone
- Most agree that urban areas should be washed over but one considers it impractical except for shallow coal or sand and gravel.
- One asks whether the policy can safeguard non designated minerals for example on the line of proposed HS2.
- It is suggested that there may be cases where deep coal could be safeguarded so as not to conflict with sensitive surface land development.
- The opinion regarding the definition of buffer zones is split. The MPA states that we should build the buffers into the MSAs in accordance with good practice rather than use the MCA. It is also stated by others that there should be no set buffer zones but that they should be determined on a case by case basis and only where absolutely necessary.
- Policy should clarify who makes the judgement on the implications of working within MSAs.
- Support is expressed for the exempt categories of development but to include also applications for Listed Building consent.
- There are other comments requesting wording changes.

Questionnaire Responses

Seven people completed this part of the questionnaire. Four comment on and agree on the extent to which the minerals should be safeguarded. Three commented on the proposed approach, with two agreeing and one being unsure.

Safeguarding Minerals Infrastructure

There have been 3 comments from 1 respondent to this strategy.

- There should be a blanket approach to safeguarding all minerals infrastructure.
- Support definition of MCAs around sites on a site by site basis

- Policies should be flexible to allow for change i.e. if facilities are removed.

Brick Clay and Fireclay

Written Responses

There have been 5 responses to this strategy document from 4 respondents

- One supports the recognition of the importance of extraction at Mouselow for Denton Brickworks

Questionnaire Responses

- Three people completed the questionnaire regarding the issue of how best to make provision for the future supply of clay. Two supported the option of making future provision through permitted reserves and specific allocations; one supported the option of making provision through permitted reserves, specific allocations and a criteria based policy.
- One respondent completed the questionnaire regarding the specific sites that have been put forward by operators for allocation in the Plan. They were in support of the allocation of land at Mouselow quarry for additional working.

Surface Mined Coal and Colliery Waste

Written Responses

44 responses have been received from 8 individuals or organisations to the various issues presented in this paper.

- Four respondents support the option of identifying the shallow coal resource and listing the constraints to coal mining development to assess any future proposals for extraction.
- There is support shown for the option of not identifying surface mining constraint areas in the Plan.
- Respondents agree that the proposed sustainable principles for coal extraction are correct and should be related to NPPF.
- There is support for a general policy for cumulative impacts covering all minerals rather than there also being a separate one for coal.

Questionnaire Responses

Forty one responses were received to the ten questions in the questionnaire relating to surface mined coal. These generally support the proposed approach and reflect the support for the various options as indicated above.

Deep Mined Coal

Written Responses

10 responses have been received from 4 individuals or organisations regarding this paper.

- There is support for not including a specific policy for deep mined coal extraction.
- There is overall agreement that national policy should be sufficient to deal with applications for deep mined coal.

Questionnaire Responses

This part of the questionnaire was completed by three individuals/organisations. Two do not support the inclusion of a specific policy for deep mined coal and one does.

Hydrocarbons

Written Responses

37 comments have been received from 19 individuals/organisations to this strategy paper.

- 3 of these broadly support the emerging policy approach set out in the paper
- One states that there should not be a separate policy for hydraulic fracturing; one policy covering hydrocarbons should be sufficient.
- Most of the respondents were against hydraulic fracturing in principle and raised concerns about impacts on the environment and communities

Cumulative Impacts

Written Responses

5 responses have been received from 4 individuals or organisations regarding this issue.

- The main concern raised is that it highlights the negative effects of mineral extraction without balancing the arguments out by discussing the positive effects which mineral production can have.
- One sets out that cumulative impacts should be just one consideration in the assessment of planning applications.

Questionnaire Responses

Two people completed the part of the questionnaire regarding the methodology to be used in assessing impacts. One supported the approach of using NPPF whilst the other supported using recent appeal decisions.

Restoration

There have been 5 responses from 5 organisations to this strategy paper.

- There is general support for the approach but with some amendments/additions put forward.
- The benefits of green infrastructure should be referred to and incorporated into the strategy.
- There should be no requirement for a restoration guarantee bond.
- Reference should be made to natural features which it is suggested should be incorporated into restoration schemes

Restoration Strategy for Carboniferous Limestone Quarries

There has been 1 response from 1 respondent to this strategy paper.

- Support for Option 1 which is to restrict the area of the study to the A515 quarries only.

Policies for Inclusion in the New Minerals Local Plan (Supporting Paper)

There has been 3 responses from 2 respondents on this supporting paper.

- Additional suggestions were made to the issues that would require policy coverage relating to the benefits of restoration and the viability of development

Duty to Co-operate (Supporting Paper)

There have been 4 responses from 2 respondents to this supporting paper.

- Two responses supported the approach that the Councils propose to adopt to plan for issues with strategic cross-boundary impacts.
- Two responses requested additional references to be included in the cross boundary issues identified.

General Comments

There have been 10 general comments from 5 respondents.

- There should be greater reference to the historic environment through the Plan. Each comment refers to a different aspect of the Plan.
- Reference should be made to the National Forest
- The Local Nature Partnership objectives should be incorporated into the Plan.

5. Summary of Responses –Hard Rock Sites Consultation

The Consultation comprised a revised Site Assessment Methodology together with five sites that were promoted for allocation by mineral companies. The Consultation ran for a 12 week period from December 2016 to February 2017. 554 respondents raised 2,417 representations to the Consultation.

Ten respondents commented on the Site Assessment Methodology and raised some 35 representations.

Site Assessment Methodology Criteria

- One respondent stated that the Site Assessment Methodology should clarify whether the assessment criteria are of equal or variable weighting. Some criteria should carry more weight than others.
- One respondent stated that the Site Assessment Methodology should take into account potential mitigation measures.
- One respondent considered that the Criteria relating to economic need were misleading and should refer to the need for additional reserves to commence during the plan period.
- One respondent considered that the quality/yield of mineral should be evaluated by using the expected yield per hectare
- One respondent considered it inappropriate at the Local Plan Site Allocation stage to require information on the end use of mineral resources to be provided.
- One respondent considered that the assessment relating to existing infrastructure favoured extensions rather than new sites contrary to NPPF.
- One respondent considered it inappropriate to include a Criteria at the Local Plan allocation stage on sterilising mineral resources.
- One respondent considered that the Criteria were inappropriate for considering building stone operations.
- Three respondents have commented that the Criteria in relation to ecology do not appropriately reflect NPPF which requires distinctions to be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status.
- One respondent has commented that the Criteria in relation to landscape do not appropriately reflect the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment (Edition3).
- One respondent has commented that the Criteria do not appropriately reflect the historic environment constraints hierarchy set out in the NPPF.
- One respondent considered that the 'buffer zones' used to assess the impacts of dust on air quality and human health do not accord with the latest guidance

in Guidance on the Assessment of Mineral Dust Impacts for planning (May 2016).

- One respondent considered that the Criteria used to assess Transport impacts are inappropriate.
- One respondent considered that the Criteria used to assess cumulative impacts should be amended and widened to reflect current practice in assessing such impacts.
- One respondent considered that the Groundwater Source Protection Zones had been wrongly classified.
- One respondent supported the Site Assessment Methodology.

A. New Parish Quarry, Darley Dale

The following is a summary of the issues which have been raised in the 318 individual letters/emails, as well as the 6 statutory organisations which also made comments. (CPRE, Natural England, Severn Trent Water, RSPB, Woodland Trust, Mineral Products Association). A petition signed by 603 people opposing the quarry was also submitted. The following is a summary of the issues raised:

Highways Impact

188 people consider the narrow local roads to be totally inadequate for HGVs. 30 of these people express the additional concern that HGVs will take the direct route to the A6 through Darley Hillside.

Health Risks from Increased Dust and Traffic Pollution

175 people expect the dust from the proposal to affect a wider area than the Councils' assessment indicates. In this respect, the 200m and 500m buffer zones used in the assessment were questioned. Particulate dust (PM10s) is of particular concern in terms of its effect on people's health, (particularly people with existing respiratory problems such as asthma) given the proximity to a large residential area, which includes two care homes for the elderly. Pollution from quarry traffic is also expressed as a major concern in terms of its impact on people's health.

Impact on the Landscape

145 people (and CPRE) express their concern about the impact of the proposal on the beauty, character and amenity of the landscape, which they consider has remained intact for centuries. Being on a south facing slope, its prominence (visual impact) in the landscape over a wide area was also raised by 66 people in this respect.

Impact on Wildlife

124 people have raised concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposal on wildlife in the area, the site and its surroundings being an important nesting and breeding area for birds, insects and mammals. Bent Lane itself is recognised locally as being an important wildlife corridor.

The RSPB is particularly concerned about the impact of the proposed haul route on birds in the SSSI and SAC to the north of the proposed site.

Ancient Woodland

The potential impact on birds in the adjacent ancient woodland of Halldale Wood (a Local Wildlife Site, which is a haven for many important native and migratory species) has been raised by 36 individuals as well as Natural England and the Woodland Trust. There are also a number of protected species in this area such as Badgers, Tawny Owls, Bats and Bramblings.

Hydrology

122 local people expect the proposal to increase the impact and occurrence of flooding in the area by disrupting the numerous natural local springs, water courses and the water table in the area and by excavation removing a large area of soil and rock which currently acts as a sponge for much of the excess water. The proposal may also disrupt the supply of water to the ponds at Whitworth Park. People also anticipate that the flooding together with the destabilisation of the land will increase the risk of landslips and landslides in the area, with spoil from Halldale Quarry being considered a risk in this respect.

Water Aqueduct

69 people and Severn Trent Water have highlighted the presence of the Victorian water aqueduct just to the south of the site. This carries water by two large Victorian cast iron pipes in a brick lined tunnel, supplying water to over 590,000 households in Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire. People are concerned that quarrying could disrupt the pipeline and lead to significant flooding of the area. STW need assurance from the developer that the integrity of the pipeline will not be affected by the working of the quarry.

Before the proposals are accepted, a full detailed study should be commissioned, at no cost to STW, of the full impact of the quarry activities on the DVA along with a flooding assessment should there be a catastrophic failure.

Noise Impacts

110 people have expressed their concern about the potential for noise from the working of the proposed quarry.

Local Economic Benefits

106 people suggest that they do not expect there to be any significant local economic benefits from the proposed quarry. They consider that the small number of jobs that would be created would be outweighed significantly by job losses in the local tourism industry if the proposal were to go ahead, and there would as a result be a net negative impact on the local economy. It is considered also that there would be a very small economic return to balance against the considerable environmental destruction from the proposal. People consider that the only significant economic benefit would be to the multi-national company which is proposing the site.

1 individual supports the proposal on the grounds that it would provide employment and revenue for the local area.

Widening of Roads

85 people (and RSPB) are concerned that the proposals would destroy the roads and verges and would make it unsafe for other road users. They are also concerned that the widening of the roads to accommodate HGVs would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area as well as on local wildlife and that it would also impact on two European protected sites to the north of Bent Lane and adjacent to Chesterfield Road on both sides. These sites are classified as the Eastern Peak District Moors SSSI, Peak District Moors SPA under the EC Birds Directive and the South Pennine Moors SAC under the EC Habitats Directive.

Need for the Stone

77 people question the need for the stone given the number of existing building stone quarries in the overall area. In this respect, people asked why the adjacent Halldale Quarry could not be worked out instead. A small number of people stated that they would be more receptive to a smaller quarry, which would produce stone for mainly local purposes.

Informal Recreation

72 people comment that the site is currently used for informal recreation by the community (walking, cycling, horse riding, running, bird watching, picnicking) being crossed by two well-used footpaths, and would be a great loss in this respect. Many people are concerned that the general health and wellbeing of the local population would be adversely affected by the loss of this area.

Impact on Tourism

65 people express their concern that the quarry would have a significant impact on local tourism, deterring people from visiting the area and its attractions.

Visual Impact from the Peak District National Park

37 individuals (and CPRE S. Yorks) raise the issue of the site being prominent in views across the Derwent Valley from the Peak District National Park.

Road Safety

36 people are concerned about the impact of HGVs on the safety of other road users should the quarry go ahead.

Impact on Designated Sites

36 people (and RSPB and Natural England and the Woodland Trust) are concerned about the potential impact of quarry working on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site/Ancient Woodland of Halldale Wood and the SSSI to the north of the site.

Scale of the Proposal

16 people have expressed their concerns regarding the scale of the proposed quarry. In this respect, people state that the proposal would not comply with the NPPF, which sets out that MPAs should recognise the small nature and impact of building stone quarries.

Impact on the Local Economy

37 people consider that the proposal would have a significant negative impact on the local economy and that any benefits would be outweighed significantly by the negative impacts of the proposal.

Proximity to Residential Areas

14 people are concerned about how close the proposal is to a large residential area, and in this respect consider that the operator should look for and consider alternative sites in more appropriate, secluded locations before this one.

Cumulative Impacts

5 people set out that the area as a whole has seen quarrying for a significant number of years and that other large manufacturing industries such as Enthovens and Firth Rixon have also had an impact on the area in terms of noise, pollution, HGV traffic etc.

Agricultural Land

7 people argue that, although the land is not classified as being BMV, it is still good quality land for grazing and silage production and generates good income for the local farmer. The loss of this resource would be detrimental to the local economy.

Disruption to Water Supply

6 residents are concerned that their only water supply from local springs will be disrupted by the quarry.

Restoration

8 people have set out that they consider that the restoration of the site would appear to offer few benefits over and above what is present on the existing site.

Archaeology

2 people consider that the site does have archaeological value and should be investigated.

Radon Gas

7 people are concerned that Radon gas will be emitted from the rock if the quarry is worked.

House Prices

6 people expressed concern that the quarry would have an impact on the price of their property.

Damage to Property/Subsidence

3 people express concern that their properties may be damaged by quarry working.

Threat to Moorland Heather

1 person has highlighted the potential adverse impact of the air pollution from the quarry on the Heather in the nearby moorland area.

New Parish Quarry - Drop-in Session, 2 February 2017

This event was held at the Whitworth Centre, Darley Dale on 2 February 2017 to give local people the opportunity to discuss with Council Officers the proposal by Stancliffe Stone Limited to include a building stone quarry off Bent Lane in the Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan.

83 people came to the event throughout the day, which was held between 9am and 7pm. These were mainly members of the public. A Town Councillor also attended, as well as the Chair of the Darley Hillside Residents Association.

Most people who attended had already sent in written comments, but six more left their comments with us on the day.

This is a summary of the issues raised:

- Local people do not expect that the economic benefits, particularly in terms of the small number of jobs proposed, would outweigh the significant adverse impacts of the proposal.
- The need for the stone was questioned given the number of existing quarries in the area. In this respect, people asked why the adjacent Halldale Quarry could not be worked out instead.
- Local people would be more receptive to a smaller quarry, which would produce stone for mainly local purposes.
- The geological information provided was questioned. People thought there would be a lot more waste material produced.
- The scale of the proposal gave cause for great concern.
- Local people expect the noise and dust from the proposal to affect a wider area than the Councils' assessment indicates. In this respect, the 200m and 500m buffer zones used in the assessment were questioned. The dust is of particular concern in terms of its effect on people's health and wellbeing.
- The cutting of the stone to the north of the proposed quarry gave cause for concern in terms of noise and dust.
- People expect the proposal to increase the impact and occurrence of flooding in the area by disrupting the numerous local springs in the area and by destabilising the land and water table.
- The Victorian water aqueduct just to the south of the site could be disrupted and flood the area.
- There were concerns that the operation could be working 24 hours a day for seven days a week.
- The roads around the site are considered to be totally inadequate for HGVs. People are concerned that they would destroy the roads and verges and would make it unsafe for other road users. Widening of the roads would have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area.
- The site is currently used for informal recreation by the community and would be a great loss in this respect.
- The impact on wildlife, particularly birds in adjacent ancient woodland.
- The adverse impact on tourism in the area.
- The proposal would have an impact on local house prices.
- Impact of the proposal on the landscape and on views from the Peak District National Park.
- People were concerned that the consultation had not reached all parts of the community.
- A number of people were concerned about the traffic counters and speed tubes that had been installed on the local roads this week.

Industrial Limestone General

General

- One respondent considered it unnecessary to allocate any new sites for industrial limestone working in view of the current land bank. They suggested that reactivating inactive sites would be a less intrusive approach particular in relation to impacts on the PDNP.

B. Whitwell Quarry

Fourteen representations were made from three respondents.

- The operator of Whitwell Quarry i.e. the promoter of the extension sites wishes to amend the site boundary of the promoted northern area extension to reflect the area included in the current planning application submitted to the MPA. The revised site boundary draws the promoted site further back from the southern edge of Whitwell village.
- The operator of Whitwell Quarry suggests that a number of detailed assessments included as part of the planning application should be used to assess impacts relating to noise, dust, blasting/vibration, the water regime and agricultural land to provide a more detailed and accurate assessment.
- Natural England stresses the importance of protecting Creswell Crags and Hollin and Markland Grips, both SSSIs.

Note of Drop-in Session, Whitwell, Friday 3rd February 2017

10 people visited the session, including Whitwell Parish Councillors, Belph and Hodthorpe Parish Councillors, Tarmac Representative and Quarry Liaison Members.

Issues raised:

Most people had no concerns about the quarry extensions.

One issue raised was how to distinguish between the emissions from the kiln and the dust emissions from the quarry. May be an issue if Lhoist burn different waste types for fuel.

One person asked about the use of material from Whitwell Colliery Tip for reclamation purposes similar to what had happened with Belph Tip.

One person stated that it was important that any sub-contractors understood and carried out the work in accordance with any planning conditions and agreements.

Most people were supportive of the proposed extensions and recognised the importance of the mineral.

C. Ashwood Dale Quarry

Three representations were made from two respondents.

- Natural England is concerned about the proximity of the site to the Peak District Dales Special Conservation Area which also includes the Wye Valley SSSI. A rigorous Habitat Regulations Assessment would be required to assess the impact of dust on these sites and ongoing dust monitoring would be a necessity.
- Natural England raised the following concern. A housing site has been allocated in the High Peak Borough Local Plan close to the promoted quarry extension; both are in close proximity to the SAC/SSSI. The cumulative impact of proposals on the ecological sites should be taken into account especially in relation to air quality and hydrological impacts.
- Natural England stated that due to the close proximity of the site to the Peak District National Park the wider impact of the site on the setting of the PDNP needs to be taken into account.
- The Woodland Trust opposes the allocation of this site unless it can be demonstrated that mitigation measures would suitably protect nearby ancient woodland from damage and loss.

Drop-in Session, Monday 6th February 2017.

25 people visited the session, including land owners near to the quarry, Cowdale residents, Buxton residents and Buxton Civic Association members.

The following issues were raised:

Most people had no concerns about the promoted quarry extension.

One person asked if there were any proposals to start quarrying at Cowdale Quarry.

One person stated that there was a need to ensure that Cuning Dale is not breached by any mineral development given its SSSI/SAC status.

One person asked about the blasting buffer zone and what this meant in practice and how it affected the proposed housing allocation in the HPBC Local Plan.

One person asked if there would be any lorry traffic passing through Fairfield.

Two people mentioned that there appeared to be extensive earth moving machinery in the permitted area near to Cuning Dale and enquired as to what and why the earthworks were taking place.

D. Aldwark/Brassington Moor Quarry

Some twenty three representations were received from seven respondees.

- The operator of Aldwark/Brassington Moor Quarry and one other respondent supported the inclusion of the site as an allocation in the Plan.
- The operator considers that the potential landscape and visual impacts of the site have been overstated including impacts on the PDNP.
- Five respondents are concerned about the impact of the proposal on the PDNP, the wider landscape, on existing PROW users and visitors to the area. Of particular concern is noise, dust, visual impacts and impacts on tranquillity.
- One respondent commented that effective mitigation strategies need to be implanted at an early stage to reduce the impact of the proposal.
- One respondent is concerned about the proximity of the site to the Peak District Dales Special Conservation Area and the Via Gellia SSSI. A rigorous Habitat Regulations Assessment would be required to assess the impact on these sites.

Note of Drop-in Session, Brassington, Friday 10th February 2017

6 people visited the session, including Brassington and Aldwark residents, Brassington Local Environment Group member, Peak District National Park Officer.

Issues raised:

One resident of Aldwark complained about the noise particularly early in the morning. She thought that the quarry use did not compliment the leisure/holiday cottages that were present at Aldwark which lies within the Peak District National Park.

People recognised the importance of the quarry as a local employer.

The Peak District National Park officer has concerns about the visual impact of the quarry extension on the wider landscape setting of the National Park.

Two residents were concerned about work that was taking place at Manor Farm close to the proposed extension area. They were concerned that mineral working was taking place without the benefit of planning permission.

E. Mouselow Quarry

Two comments were received from one respondent.

- Natural England stated that due to the proximity of the site (within 2km) of the PDNP account needs to be taken of the wider impact of the promoted site on the setting of the PDNP.

Drop- in Session, Monday 13th February 2017

8 people visited the session, including a County Councillor, a High Peak Borough Councillor, a Wienerberger representative, a Boothventures representative, Chair of Mouselow Quarry Liaison Committee, a Higher Dinting resident.

Issues raised:

One Higher Dinting resident was concerned about the impact of the quarry in terms of views, land instability and any increase in dust, noise or traffic on the surrounding area.

Other visitors raised the impact of the quarry on the surrounding landscape as the main issue relating to the extension.

Councillor Wilcox asked if there would be any increased traffic as a result of the extension.

The operator, Wienerberger, is keen to engage with people living locally to the quarry to answer any concerns before a planning application is submitted for the site which could be later in 2017.

Most visitors appreciated the importance of the quarry in terms of the need for the continued supply of material to Denton brickworks and the resulting employment that it provided.

A Borough Councillor was particularly concerned about another quarry in High Peak, Birchvale/Arden quarry/landfill site and the problem with odour from the landfill site.