

Summary of Responses to Potential Sand and Gravel Sites

**Leicestershire Minerals
Development
Framework
(LMDF)**

Summary of Responses to Potential Sand and Gravel Sites

Ref. No.	Individual or Organisation	Summary of Comments	Response
Thurlaston/Huncote			
1	Blaby D.C.	<p>Blaby District Council does not object to the proposed allocation of this extension to Huncote Quarry for sand and gravel extraction provided that;</p> <p>a) It satisfies the matters raised by this Council in its representations concerning planning application 04/0301/1/CY;</p> <p>b) That the need for this quantum of sand and gravel is established; and</p> <p>c) That this need cannot be met from more sustainable locations elsewhere in the County.</p> <p>Blaby District Council was consulted on this application and <u>did not object</u> to the planning application subject to the imposition of conditions to address various matters.</p>	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.
2	Huncote P.C.	The Parish Council sees no reason to alter the comments that it made in respect of the recent planning application on the site.	See above.
3	Thurlaston P.C.	<p>The Parish Council's views and concerns relating to the extension for Huncote Quarry, or as Thurlaston Parishioners view it, a new quarry at Thurlaston, have been put to Leicestershire County Council on a number of occasions. Acresford have had their planning application turned down once and have recently withdrawn their appeal.</p> <p>There is strong public opinion that this extension/new quarry should not be allowed to proceed within the Parish of Thurlaston.</p> <p>Listed below are the main points of concern regarding this proposed site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Noise which would be generated by working in close proximity to the village of Thurlaston. 2) The map you attached shows the proposed site over a small wooded Spinney called Ash Spinney, which we believe as a Preservation Order on it. 3) The transporting of any sand and gravel from any proposed workings would need to go via a narrow farm access bridge over the M69 motorway. There are a number of concerns with this including the bridge is used as a part of the Bridleway for horses. 	See above.

		<p>4) Hydrogeology. Any quarrying on this scale will dewater the area around it, we believe up to 2 kilometres. This will affect the remaining agriculture in the area including fields and a Nature Pond.</p> <p>5) Wildlife on the fields where the proposed quarry will be sited will also be affected these include, Brown Hares, Muntjac, Partridge, Badgers, Foxes, Red Leg and more importantly English Grey Partridge which are very scarce in Leicestershire (we believe there are a number of breeding pairs in the area). There are a number of species of birds, including Lapwings and Yellow Hammers.</p> <p>6) Currently house prices in Thurlaston command high premiums in comparison to neighbouring villages, there is a strong feeling that property values within the village will be affected by any proposed quarry.</p> <p>To conclude, it is the opinion of the Parish Council that it would be detrimental to the character of the village and also to the lives of the Parishioners for this development to be permitted within the Parish of Thurlaston.</p>	
4	Highways	Access off Croft Road, Thurlaston would not be acceptable due to the unsuitability of local roads.	See above.
5	DEFRA	No post 1988 ALC information. ALC Predictive map shows whole site as BMV Class 2 (20-60% BMV grades likely).	Noted.
6	English Nature	Not aware of any statutory nature conservation constraints to this site.	Noted.
Flash Farm, Huncote			
1	Blaby D.C.	<p>Blaby District Council does not support the proposed allocation of Flash Farm, Huncote for sand and gravel extraction for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) It is likely to have a considerable impact on both the landscape of the area and the amenities of residents of Huncote and Narborough. Both settlements have experienced the impacts of mineral extraction and subsequent landfill operations at the former Narborough Quarry for many years; and</p> <p>b) The small- scale extension of existing sites is preferred, in principle, to the opening of new quarries.</p>	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation
3	Huncote P.C.	<p>Has several major concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of site will have considerable impact on the community • Area has experienced considerable disturbance from quarrying and landfill activities over last 20 years • Would be close to residential area near the Green 	See above.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would cause additional traffic problems in an area that already suffers from major traffic problems. • Need to protect railway line from damage due to workings. • Potential impact on River Soar and flood prevention plans for the area. 	
7	Narborough P.C.	Raises major and grave concerns. The site is sufficiently close to residential areas of Narborough Parish to be a potential very unwelcome development.	See above.
4	Highways	Access off Huncote Road, Narborough/Narborough Road, Huncote would not be acceptable due to local concerns regarding lorry traffic. Access through Croft Quarry may require the installation of traffic signals.	See above.
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	The proposed quarrying area has significant archaeological potential for all periods from the prehistoric to the early medieval. The possibility of Paleolithic remains being present in the sands and gravels is an important consideration.	See above.
9	Environment Agency	Measures will need to be taken to protect the River Soar and Thurlaston Brook. The proposed water based amenity after-use is unacceptable. There are several groundwater and surface water abstractions within 1km of the site	See above.
5	DEFRA	No post 1988 ALC information. ALC Predictive map shows most of site as BMV Class 3 (<20% BMV grades likely) with some BMV Class 1 (>60% BMV likely) in the NW.	Noted.
6	English Nature	Site is approx. 600 metres from Croft and Huncote Quarry SSSI. This is a geological SSSI so there is unlikely to be any damage to the SSSI from drawdown of the water table.	Noted.
Shawell/Cotesbach			
10	Cotesbach P.C.	Due to closer proximity to the village and the potential for intensification of nuisance, area should be restricted and conditions imposed at least as those on recent permissions. Concern that additional pieces of land abutting and surrounding Town End Farm intrude into the vicinity of the village more than previous proposal; impact on public highway bounding part of the area; reclamation and restoration proposals for the fields adjacent to Town End Farm and the highway. Concern about potential disruption of bridlepaths and footpaths	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect local amenity are site planning requirements.
11	Shawell P.M.	Working should be confined to current operating hours at the Quarry. Vehicle movements on Gibbet Lane should not be allowed to exceed current levels.	See above
12	Mr & Mrs Chapman, Sutton House, Cotesbach	Opposed to the proposed intrusion into additional pieces of land surrounding Town End Farm. This would encroach too far on the village and render the adopted road adjacent to the farm useless due to noise, pollution and aesthetic degradation.	See above.

4	Highways	Access directly off the A426 or the lane near Town End would not be acceptable.	As a preferred allocation, the use of the existing route to the processing plant via Gibbet Lane is a site planning requirement
9	Environment Agency	The site is next to an existing PPC landfill. A new permit will have to be applied for to infill the site.	Noted
6	English Nature	The site is within 500 metres of Cave's Inn Pits SSSI. Need to demonstrate that extraction would not affect the features of special interest of the SSSI.	As a preferred allocation, proposals will need to accord with policies in the MDF which seek to protect SSSIs.
5	DEFRA	No post 1988 ALC information. ALC Predictive map shows whole site as BMV Class 2 (20-60% BMV grades likely).	Noted. As a preferred allocation, the preservation of best and most versatile soil resources is a site planning requirement.
4	Senior Planning Archaeologist	Significant potential for buried archaeological remains.	As a preferred allocation appropriate archaeological investigation is a site planning requirement

Husbands Bosworth			
6	English Nature	The site is within 1km metres of Bosworth Mill Meadow SSSI. Need to demonstrate that extraction would not affect the features of special interest of the SSSI.	As a preferred allocation, proposals will need to accord with policies in the MDF which seek to protect SSSIs.
5	DEFRA	NE half covered by detailed post 1988 ALC survey: identified mostly grade 2 with some 3a/b in NW. ALC Predictive map shows whole site as BMV Class 1 (>60% BMV grades likely).	Noted. As a preferred allocation, the preservation of best and most versatile soil resources is a site planning requirement.
9	Environment Agency	The proposed area contains a small patch of woodland/grassland along the east bank of the canal. Appropriate surveys should be carried out for bat roosts and nesting birds. Mitigation for loss of habitat should be incorporated in the restoration plan.	As a preferred allocation, measures to protect existing trees and woodland and restoration proposals to enhance biodiversity are site planning requirements
4	Highways	Access to the site would only be acceptable via the existing site access and conveyor across the A5199.	As a preferred allocation, the use of the existing route to

			the processing plant via Welford Road is a site planning requirement
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	Area rich in prehistoric archaeology. Extension area should be fully assessed followed, as necessary, by an appropriate level of archaeological field work.	As a preferred allocation appropriate archaeological investigation is a site planning requirement
Slip Inn Quarry, Ashby Parva			
13	Ashby Parva P.M.	As far as the Parish is concerned, extraction workings have created some nuisance from noise and dust, although RMC had generally tried hard to reduce the effect on Ashby Parva and Dunton Bassett. The proposed area is less likely to cause concern to Ashby Parva because it is further from the village, though problems with noise and dust (and traffic?) would still apply.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.
14	Dunton Bassett P.C.	Strongly objects to the proposal on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be too near to village and have a severe and negative impact on the amenity of local residents. • Similar plans have previously been rejected following a public inquiry. • Prevailing wind would carry noise and dust to all parts of the village. • Would have a significant effect on house prices throughout the village. • Would affect 3 footpaths all of which are well-used and valued local recreation amenities. • Access arrangements are unclear. Transportation to the existing quarry will cause noise which will be audible in the village. • Significant visual impact from Ashby Parva Lane and from a number of sites to the south of the village • Would be significant and detrimental effects to several areas of woodland and copses particularly in gaining access to the existing site. • Effects on wildlife 	See above.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern at increased traffic, and associated noise and pollution, using A426 and B581. 	
15	<u>District Cllr Rosita Page</u> (Ward Member for Ullesthorpe)	The Dunton Bassett operation needs to be safeguarded by additional conditions regarding hours, lights, road safety, routing agreement and to keep the roads clean.	See above.
9	Environment Agency	Need to consider impact on stream running to south of site. Protection measures needed for nature conservation sites within and adjacent to the site.	See above
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	Potential for buried archaeological remains, but general lack of data.	See above
4	Highways	Access would only be acceptable via the existing site access off the A426. Continued use of this access may require some improvement due to its restricted visibility.	See above
5	DEFRA	No post 1988 ALC information. ALC Predictive map shows whole site as BMV Class 1 (>60% BMV grades likely). Whole site surveyed in 1980: just over half of site grade 2; remainder 3a.	Noted
6	English Nature	Not aware of any statutory nature conservation constraints to this site.	Noted
North Kilworth			
16	<u>District Cllr. Brian Smith</u> (Ward Member for Bosworth)	Considers that there is sufficient capacity within the existing open gravel pits together with extensions proposed for those open pits to enable the demand to be met without the need to open new ones especially at North Kilworth.	The site has not been selected as a preferred allocation.
17	Kimcote & Walton P.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be a significant impact on the local roads which are already acknowledged as being inadequate in width for the current volume of traffic There should be no access whatsoever west along Bosworth Road which has had a 7.5 Ton limit for a long time for the above reason If the prevailing wind was from the east there could be noise and or smell from the quarrying activity in the village of Walton If the scheme was to get the go ahead there would need to be strict enforcement of the current 7.5 Tons weight limit in the adjacent villages and the upgrade of the roads most affected to allow their use for lorries as part of the MDF. <p>The councillors have resolved to object to the proposed mineral extraction previously and do not believe there is any information presented which would cause them to determine differently.</p>	See above.
18	North Kilworth P.C.	<p>Previous comments and concerns submitted in respect the Aggregate Industries planning application during 2004 /2005 still stand.</p> <p>1. Of the 9 sites listed, only 2 are new sites, one of which is the Pincet Lane site. The adverse effects of a mineral extraction site on the environment and the local road system will generally</p>	See above.

		<p>tend to be greater for a new site than for the extension of an existing site.</p> <p>2. The Department of the Environment, in their consideration of the Pincet Lane site, was of the opinion that all traffic leaving and entering the site had to travel to/from the north, and not enter the village of North Kilworth. This condition of planning will limit the viability of the site.</p> <p>3. The important geology of the land, in particular the aquifer, will be under threat. The findings of the hydrology report we commissioned remain relevant. Indeed the Environment Agency have in the last few months identified the aquifer in the Consultation Document "Warwickshire Avon Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy"(CAMS).</p>	
Cadeby			
9	Environment Agency	Several groundwater abstraction licences exist within the area of all four identified sites and lakes lie to the east of Area D.	As a preferred allocation, measures to address the potential impacts on controlled waters is a site planning requirement.
6	English Nature	Not aware of any statutory nature conservation constraints to this site.	Noted
4	Highways	Mitigation works may be required to improve highway safety on the A447.	Noted
5	DEFRA	No post 1988 ALC information available. The predictive map shows the whole of Areas C and D as BMV Class 1 (>60% BMV Grades likely). Most of Areas A and B are also BMV Class 1, with small areas of BMV Class 2 (20-60% BMV likely). Area C is mostly covered by a pre-1988 ALC survey identifying grade 2 land.	Noted. As a preferred allocation, the preservation of best and most versatile soil resources is a site planning requirement.
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	All of proposed extension sites have some archaeological potential with recorded sites dating from prehistoric to post-medieval times. Area B is known to contain earthworks of various dates as well as lying close to possible Iron Age/Roman settlement sites.	As a preferred allocation appropriate archaeological

			investigation is a site planning requirement
Brooksby			
19	Rearsby P.C.	No comments	
20	Hoby with Rotherby P.C.	<p>The councillors are mainly concerned over the proposal to use the Brooksby site for waste management, and clearly any extension to the quarried area would extend both the time and the geographical area devoted to landfill. From that point of view, the councillors would be strongly opposed to the extension of the site.</p> <p>If the site were <u>not</u> to be used for waste management, then the councillors' main concerns (as with the original planning application) would be that the proposed quarry extension should not impact on the local environment in terms of noise, dust and traffic movements. There should also be plans to restore the landscape after extraction is complete.</p>	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect local amenity are site planning requirements
21	Gaddesby P.C.	No objections provided that no vehicles connected with the quarry pass through villages of Ashby Folville, Barsby and Gaddesby; and that the quarry only operates during daylight hours.	See above.
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	<p>A number of recorded archaeological sites are known either from within or in the immediate vicinity of the proposed addition working areas. A range of additional sites are known in the wider area. Taken together, this would suggest a potential for buried archaeological remains that would merit proper consideration in the context of any future proposal for mineral extraction. In addition to the buried archaeological potential, the materials proposed for extraction are of significance as they comprise deposits laid down prior to the Anglian Glaciation (c. 480,000 -430,000bp). These deposits are potentially of national significance, and therefore should be the subject of specific consideration in the event of any application for mineral extraction.</p> <p>It is recommended that any allocation of the sites include the proviso that proper archaeological and palaeoecological assessment will be required to inform a planning decision</p>	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect archaeological interest are site planning requirements
Lockington			
22	N.W.L.D.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site lies within floodplain of Trent/Soar. • Wood at centre of site and immediately adjoining southern boundary of site are subject to TPO. • Possible impact on neighbouring residential properties. • Impact of M1 widening on western part of site 	As a preferred allocation appropriate measures to protect the floodplain and local amenity

			are site planning requirements
6	English Nature	The site is within 500 metres of Lockington Marshes SSSI. Need to demonstrate that extraction would not affect the features of special interest of the SSSI.	As a preferred allocation, measures to protect the SSSI is a site planning requirement.
9	Environment Agency	The site is within 300m of Lockington Marshes SSSI and any proposal should not have a detrimental impact on the favourable con status of the SSSI. Consideration will need to be given to the impact the watercourses within the site boundary. Appropriate pollution prevent measures will be required.	As a preferred allocation, measures to protect the SSSI is a site planning requirement. Proposals will also need to accord with policies in the MDF which seek to protect the water environment
4	Highways	No issues for the County Highways Authority as long as access/egress continues to be via the access off Junction 24A of the M1 Motorway.	Noted.
8	Senior Planning Archaeologist	Previous archaeological work has proved that the site has an archaeological potential, especially in the prehistoric. Intrusive field investigation should be completed in advance of any planning decision.	As a preferred allocation appropriate archaeological investigation is a site planning requirement
5	DEFRA	Post 1988 ALC information for most of site found mix of 3a/b grades. ALC Predictive map shows	Noted. As a

		whole site as BMV Class 2 (20-60% BMV grades likely)	preferred allocation, the preservation of best and most versatile soil resources is a site planning requirement.
--	--	--	--