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1 Introduction

1.1 The Planning Application

1.1.1 This application is submitted to Northamptonshire County Council on behalf of Peter Bennie Ltd. It seeks to gain permission for a revised restoration scheme for Pitsford Pond with associated inert recycling operations at Pitsford Quarry. These works would be carried out alongside further extraction of the Northampton Sand Ironstone mineral reserve in Phase 1 at Pitsford Quarry.

1.1.2 The submission includes the following information, documents and drawings:

Documents
- Planning Application Form, Ownership Certificate B and Agricultural Holdings Certificate
- Northamptonshire County Council Validation Checklist
- Ecological Assessment (including additional wintering bird survey)
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Hydrogeological Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Restoration and 5 Year Aftercare Scheme

Drawings
- GPP/PB/PP/12/01 Site Location Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/02 Site Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/03 Site Layout Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/05 Restoration Contours
- GPP/PB/PP/13/05 Existing and Proposed Bunds
- GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/06 Catchment Area Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/07 Phasing Plan
- GPP/PB/PP/12/08 Photopanel A
- GPP/PB/PP/13/08 Photopanel B
- GPP/PB/PP/13/08 Photopanel C
- Cross Sections - Proposed Filling for Agriculture (Barton Plant Ltd)
- Existing Levels (Barton Plant Ltd)
- Cut & Fill depths (Barton Plant Ltd)
- Harlestone Quarry (Barton Plant Ltd)
- Plan A Pitsford/Boughton

1.2 The Applicant

1.2.1 The applicant, Peter Bennie Ltd, founded in 1942, is a privately owned independent quarrying company. It is also a market leader in associated quarrying activities such as mineral processing and tipper haulage.

1.2.2 Based at Burton Latimer, the business is renowned for its quality of service and products, technical expertise and knowledge. This expertise is not only in the production process but also
in health, safety and environmental management, which is a critical factor for its own operations and those of major clients.

1.2.3 The company is committed to promoting and improving best practice for the industry. Peter Bennie Ltd is registered with the Contractors Mechanical Plant Engineers (C.M.P.E), The Waste Management Industry Training and Advisory Board (WAMITAB) and undertakes its recycling in accordance with the Protocol devised by Waste and Resources Action Programme (W.R.A.P).

1.3 Statutory Environmental Considerations

1.3.1 The proposed development falls within paragraph 11 (b) of Schedule 2 of The Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, defined development. This is stated as ‘Installations for the disposal of waste…the area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare’.

1.3.2 The area of the site is approximately 4.8 hectares, of which 0.3 hectares comprises the access to Pitsford Quarry and 1.8 hectares relates to the inert recycling operations. Site compound and haul road giving a balance of 2.7 hectares to be restored. Therefore, the proposed development falls within Schedule 2, and a decision was made as to whether an EIA was required and if the planning application must be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

1.4 Environmental Impact Assessment

1.4.1 The proposed development falls within paragraph 11 (b) of Schedule 2 of The Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, defined development. This is stated as ‘Installations for the disposal of waste…the area of the development exceeds 0.5 ha’.

1.4.2 The area of the site is approximately 4.8ha therefore the proposed development falls within Schedule 2, and a decision was made as to whether an EIA was required and if the planning application must be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

1.4.3 A Screening Opinion was requested from Northamptonshire County Council on 30th October 2012. The Screening Opinion response from Northamptonshire County Council on 22nd November 2012 confirms that:

There are no criteria in this instance that would suggest the project would have significant effects on the environment and it is relevant that the site was a former quarry and it is a previously worked area that is to be restored. As such an Environmental Statement would not be required to accompany an application for the proposal.

1.4.4 A copy of the Screening Opinion is provided in Appendix 1.

1.5 The Application Site and Surrounding Area

Site Location and Access

1.5.1 The proposed development site is to be accessed off the A508, Harborough Road, using the access point to the Pitsford Quarry. This application seeks to cover development within the Pitsford Quarry site and also within the nearby Pitsford Pond, both of which are included within
the redline boundary. The location of the site is shown on Drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-01 and the extent of the site is shown on Drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-02 Site Plan.

1.5.2 The development site is located within Daventry District Council and Northamptonshire County Council jurisdictions.

Sensitive Receptors

1.5.3 The nearest residential properties can be found approximately 160m to the south at Bunkers Hill residential complex, with the Village of Pitsford approximately 1km north of the site.

1.5.4 In 2011, Pitsford Quarry was designated by the Wildlife Trust as a Local Wildlife Site which is a non-statutory designation. Also within the north-east of the Quarry area is a Local Geological Site.

1.5.5 Pitsford Water, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Country Park lies 2km to the north of the site.

1.5.6 Boughton Park, which is Grade II listed on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, lies approximately 400m to the south-west.

1.5.7 Approximately 1.5km south-west of the site is the Boughton Bowl Barrow Scheduled Ancient Monument. Approximately 1.2km north-west of the site is Longmans Hill Long Barrow Scheduled Ancient Monument.

1.5.8 Pitsford Quarry has remained unused for a number of years due to market conditions, however much of the infrastructure such as weighbridge and wheelwash remains in place for future use. Pitsford Pond was created by previous mineral workings which now contains a body of water and over the previous 30 years has operated as a local coarse fishery. This is shown on Drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-03.

1.6 Proposed Development

1.6.1 The proposed development will consist of the infilling and revised restoration of the former mineral workings at Pitsford Pond, situated off the Moulton Road. In association with this proposal the applicant wishes to set up a temporary inert waste recycling activity to sort and screen imported inert material, the waste from which would be used in the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond. In addition, there will also be separate mineral excavation and extraction of Phase 1 at Pitsford Quarry, carried out in compliance with the modern planning conditions.

1.6.2 Pitsford Quarry is accessed via the site access route from the A508, Harborough Road. Access to Pitsford Pond will be gained by creating a haul road across the separating piece of agricultural land, to link Pitsford Quarry with Pitsford Pond. The operator will also have use of the existing weighbridge and wheelwash in the quarry compound area, as shown on drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-03 Site Layout Plan. In addition a weighbridge office will be brought back to be sited adjacent to the weighbridge.
Recycling

1.6.3 The recycling operations are intended to replace those currently in operation at the Harlestone Quarry, for the 3 year period of the restoration of Pitsford Pond. It is expected that up to 85,000 tonnes per annum of clean inert materials from construction and demolition operations will be imported into the Pitsford Quarry. Mixed loads will be screened and segregated. Following this suitable material will be crushed to produce recycled aggregates and will involve no more than 25,000 tonnes per annum to be transported off-site and sold. The balance will be used for the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond (see below).

1.6.4 It is proposed that this recycled aggregate will be removed from the site through backloading the HGV’s used to deliver the inert material to the site; this will minimise the traffic generated by the various activities.

1.6.5 If 25,000 tonnes of inert material are to be recycled each year, it is expected that this will take 25 working days to do so. The applicant has indicated that the crushing machine which will be used for the recycling operations has the ability to process 1000 tonnes per day therefore to make the recycling operations viable the applicant will stockpile enough material before undertaking recycling operations. This will mean that the crushing operations will be intermittent throughout the 3 years which will significantly reduce the impacts of noise and dust on the nearby sensitive receptors.

Revised Restoration Scheme

1.6.6 It is assumed that 60,000 tonnes per annum of inert materials will be used as part of the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond. Only clean, inert and naturally occurring soils will be used for the restoration operations.

1.6.7 Deliberate steps have been undertaken within the design of the revised restoration scheme to ensure that the development will bring environmental and biodiversity enhancement to its locality as set out within the Restoration and Aftercare scheme in Appendix 5. To mitigate the loss of existing vegetation and habitat, the restoration and aftercare scheme provides the following:

- Creation of a new wetland to the naturally low-lying south-west corner of the site, together with a small area of rough grassland and associated shrubs.
- Planting of 147m of new native hedgerow along the northern boundary.
- Planting of 3 small areas of native trees and shrubs.
- Creation of good agriculture land for arable use.
- Planting of 11 individual native trees.
- Creation of 6m wide grass headlands for Biodiversity Action Plan target species.

Waste Recovery Permit

1.6.8 An application will be sought from the Environment Agency for a Waste Recovery Permit which will cover the proposed operations. This will contain condition to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on the environment.

1.6.9 In order to comply with Waste Recovery Permit regulations, the minimum amount of fill required for the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond amounts to approximately 170,000 tonnes.
of inert fill. A restoration and aftercare scheme will help to achieve contours suitable for the establishment of agriculture land with appropriate drainage.

**Timescales, Quantums and Phasing**

1.6.10 The clean inert material required for the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond amounts to 100,000m³ (170,000 tonnes), varying in thickness across the application site as shown on Drawing Cut and Fill depths (Barton Plant Ltd). The fill is required to ensure that ground level is above groundwater level and to provide a field suitable for working with modern agriculture vehicles.

1.6.11 Restoration will be progressive and phased as shown on Drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-07 Phasing Plan.

1.6.12 For continued drainage of the site, a settlement lagoon will be constructed in the south west corner of Pitsford Pond, as set out in drawing KB-PIT001. The final revised restoration surface will be profiled to distribute surface water towards the perimeters and maintain a relatively well drained field during wet periods.

1.6.13 The total restoration period of Pitsford Pond is anticipated to take up to 3 years.

**Mineral Extraction**

1.6.14 As Pitsford Quarry will be re-opened in association with the revised restoration of the nearby Pitsford Pond, it therefore makes it economically viable to extract the remaining Northampton Sand Ironstone for sale at market. This stone can be processed as building stone or crushed aggregate thus enabling operations at Harlestone Quarry to be scaled down for this 3 year period. All operation would be undertaken as previously before they were shut down in favour of working at Harlestone Quarry.

1.6.15 The extraction process will be undertaken in compliance with Planning Permission DA/97/1140C which will involve further extraction of Northampton Sand Ironstone. It is expected that up to 50,000 tonnes per annum will be extracted from the Quarry floor.

**Harlestone Quarry**

1.6.16 Current operations at Harlestone Quarry involve the importation of inert waste to restore the void left from the previous mineral workings, inert recycling operations and further extraction of the existing mineral reserve. If mineral extraction operations within the quarry were to stop now, this would leave a void of 60,000m³ to be restored using inert waste. However, as there is still a large volume of the mineral reserve which the operator plans to extract, then this only leaves 40,000m³ of void to be restored as the site operator requires 20,000m³ in which to locate stockpiles and operate machinery associated with the extraction operations.

1.6.17 The existing situation at Harlestone Quarry has been recently surveyed to show the remaining void requiring restoration and also the different areas of the quarry currently in use. This is shown on drawing Harlestone Quarry (Barton Plant Ltd). Photos of the existing situation at Harlestone Quarry are also shown on drawings GPP-PB-PP-13-08 Photograph Panel B & C.

1.6.18 The waste receipts provided to the Environment Agency has indicated that for the year 2012, 65,000m³ of inert waste was received by Harlestone Quarry for disposal.
1.6.19 Assuming that planning permission is granted for this application, by the time the applicant is authorized to undertake inert disposal operations at Pitsford Pond, it is expected that the remaining void of 40,000m$^3$ at Harlestone Quarry will be full, therefore leaving the applicant and other inert waste transport companies without a facility to dispose of inert waste generated by the continuing developments in and around Northampton.

1.6.20 The applicant has indicated that due to the limited mineral reserve remaining within Pitsford Quarry, they may continue to extract stone from Harlestone Quarry as a way of meeting demand. Whilst this will create a void for inert disposal, this may only be intermittent throughout the year depending on market conditions and will not deliver the capacity required for inert disposal within the locality.

**General Site Operations**

1.6.21 All activities within the site will operate between the hours of 07.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 07.00 to 13.00 Saturday. The site will not be in operation on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

**Access and Haul Road**

1.6.22 The proposed haul route will form an extension of the existing access route from Pitsford Quarry through an existing piece of grassland at the southern end of the arable field to Pitsford Pond, which shall be made up of a hardcore base. This haul road will be used by heavy goods vehicles and plant machinery to transport clean inert material into the application area.

**Construction of Soil Bund**

1.6.23 It is proposed that a soil bund will be constructed along the southern boundary of the application area which includes the haul road and Pitsford Pond area. The proposed soil bund will be constructed as so to mitigate any noise and visual impacts which may arise as a result of the proposed restoration activities therefore safeguarding the amenity of the nearby sensitive receptors.

1.6.24 When constructed the soil bund will be approximately 170m in length and will not exceed 3m in height with seeded slopes.

1.6.25 The handling of soil to create the bunds shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP13/05 Existing and Proposed Bunds will be undertaken in line with the guidance provided by the ‘Good Practice Guide for Handling Soil’, published by the Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food in April 2000.

1.6.26 Standoff distances have been calculated so that the soil bunds do not impose on the trees situated along the southern boundary of both the haul road and the Pitsford Pond area. Standoff distances have been calculated using guidance set out in BS5837:2012 ‘Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations’.

1.6.27 The proposed soil bund will only remain in place for the duration of the restoration scheme, once the restoration of Pitsford Pond has been completed the bund will be removed and used as part of the restoration of the haul road.
Public Rights of Way

1.6.28 There are two public rights of way in the vicinity of the Pitsford Pond site; as shown on drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-02. Public Right of Way CC2 located west of Pitsford Pond; CC13 is located outside the eastern boundary of the application site and is not expected to be affected.

1.6.29 Public Right of Way CC2 will be crossed by HGV’s and plant machinery transporting inert material between Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond. In order to maintain the Public Right of Way and ensure the continued safety of users, suitable signage, fencing and crossing points will be put in place.

Aftercare Scheme

1.6.30 A detailed Restoration and 5 Year Aftercare Scheme for Pitsford Pond is included in Appendix 5. This scheme is aimed at restoring soils to their original quality to enable a normal crop rotation to be resumed.

1.7 Development Need and Benefits

Need for the development

Revised Restoration Scheme

1.7.1 As stated within the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy DPD:

Provisions should be made to meet the following indicative waste disposal capacities during the plan period:

- Inert fill disposal capacity of 693,000 and 813,000 tonnes per annum for 2016 and 2026 respectively.

Provision for inert waste disposal should be made at mineral extraction sites requiring restoration, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that an alternative location would not prejudice the restoration of these sites.

1.7.2 There is a requirement to meet the capacity as set out above in the upcoming years. In addition, there is a shortfall of capacity to serve the Northampton area, with the closure of Boughton Quarry and the filling of the current void at Harlestone Quarry. This proposal will contribute to meeting this shortfall as well as providing a suitable location for the disposal of inert waste material, which will primarily serve the Northampton market.

1.7.3 Also stated above is the need for inert waste disposal at mineral extraction sites requiring restoration. The proposed use of inert material to achieve a revised restoration of the former minerals extraction site to agricultural use contributes to achieving this.
Recycling

1.7.4 Objective 6: Efficient use and re-use of mineral resources; of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy DPD states:

*Ensure efficient use of primary aggregates and encourage the use of secondary and recycled materials for higher quality end-uses for development to support the growth of Northamptonshire and its infrastructure requirements.*

1.7.5 There is a requirement to ensure that mineral resources are protected and where appropriate, the re-use and recycling of inert waste to produce recycled aggregates is encouraged. This proposal seeks to recycle inert waste material to produce recycled aggregates which can later be re-sold at market.

**Benefits of the Development**

**Economic Benefit**

1.7.6 A benefit of the development will be the revised restoration of the site to provide a suitable surface for agriculture purposes. At present the site fails to present any value to the landowner, as the fishery is not profitable.

1.7.7 It is the landowners’ intention to close the fishery in the coming months as he no longer considers it as a viable source of income. If this were to happen Pitsford Pond could no longer be regarded as having any recreational value.

1.7.8 The landowner’s farming business is currently reliant upon arable and livestock farming for its core source of income. Agricultural incomes are increasingly under pressure and there is a well-established need for farming businesses to generally increase in size and scale in order to remain economically viable. A major constraint to a farming business increasing in size and scale is the lack of available land and the high capital cost associated with its purchase. Opportunities to rent extra land are rare and rental values remain high due to the high level of competition from existing landowners.

1.7.9 Consequently the landowner has assessed his property assets and has identified those that are not contributing to the economic viability of the business. The fishing lake at Pitsford is one of those property assets identified. The fishery enterprise has not been economical for the landowner and he is seeking to restore the land to agriculture use.

1.7.10 The landowner has indicated that Pitsford Pond is not large enough to operate as a viable fishery which has meant he has been unable to attract the number of members needed to achieve an income which covers the running costs of managing the pond.

1.7.11 The appointment of Peter Bennie Ltd based in Burton Latimer, as the contractor for the filling, allows the financial assets that will be derived from the development to remain within the local area.
Environmental Benefit

1.7.12 A revised restoration of the former minerals site using inert waste material makes a significant contribution to the aims of sustainable development by returning land to agriculture and enabling beneficial use of inert waste material.

1.7.13 The revised restoration of the former minerals extraction site will return the application site to a form which is in keeping with the surrounding local Moulton Slopes landscape area.

1.7.14 Deliberate steps have been undertaken within the design of the revised restoration scheme to ensure that the development will bring environmental and biodiversity enhancement to its locality as set out in the Restoration and Aftercare scheme in Appendix 5.

1.7.15 The revised restoration of Pitsford Pond will provide considerable wildlife enhancement. The new areas of wetland and hedgerow are priority habitats within the local biodiversity action plan. The new areas of woodland, scrub and grass margins will contribute towards supporting the target species set out in the local biodiversity action plan.

1.7.16 A number of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, which indicate various areas within the local wildlife site to be designated for the protection of particular species. As shown on the drawing, areas will be fenced off for retention of bare ground as so to create a suitable habitat for invertebrates.

1.7.17 It is also proposed that over the following two winters, the scrub around the two ponds on T’s Wood would be cleared to reinstate a suitable habitat for Great Crested Newts. As shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, areas of artificial nests will be created for the sand martins identified within the quarry.

Health and Safety/Public Nuisance

1.7.18 The landowner has indicated that at present he faces a daily battle to maintain an adequate standard of health and safety within the Pitsford Pond site. Since becoming landowner of the site, he has encountered various cases of vandalism to the access gates and locks, on-site toilets, security devices and stolen lifebuoys and lifebuoy rings.

1.7.19 The landowner has also highlighted other problems associated with the pond especially during hours of darkness where fish within the pond have been stolen and illegal dumping (bagged waste, motorbikes, green waste).

1.7.20 For as long as this site remains in its current state, it will continue to attract problems of a similar nature which is why the landowner has sought a revised restoration scheme for the pond area to a more beneficial use.

Use of Non-Waste Material

1.7.21 The revised restoration scheme for the former quarry void at Pitsford Pond requires the importation of inert material to create a suitable surface for agriculture purposes.
1.7.22 Government policy indicates that wherever possible, preference is to be given to the use of reclaimed material for the restoration of land. The proposed use of the inert fill therefore fits in with the requirements of the national policy.

1.7.23 In technical terms the use of non-waste material would be possible, but in part it would be the equivalent of putting back excavated material. The diversion of valuable mineral resource to be used as fill material would reduce the amount of mineral that would be available on the open market. This would divert a mineral resource from use at alternative sites through its utilisation as fill for the revised restoration scheme.
2 PLANNING HISTORY AND POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Planning History

2.1.1 There is no planning history recorded for the application site, however historical maps dating back to the early 1900's show the extraction of minerals from the site. These maps show extraction was spread across the Pitsford Pond site and land east of the application site. Environment Agency data records indicate that land east of the application site was operated as an inert landfill site post extraction. Environment Agency records show that waste was received to this site between 1940 and 1987.

2.1.2 In July 1998 a Review of Mineral Planning Permission under the Provisions of the Environment Act 1995, extraction of Northampton sand ironstone and overlying materials took place (DA/97/1140C) relating to the land to the west and south of Pitsford Pond, covering Pitsford Quarry. The extent of this permission is shown on Plan A Pitsford/Boughton.

2.1.3 In November 2001 a planning application (DA/00/1153C) for the construction of a Quarry Compound was granted.

2.1.4 In June 2004 a planning application (DA/2004/0344) was granted for the importation of naturally occurring materials to achieve the restoration of phase 3 of quarry workings at Pitsford Quarry. This was completed and the permission has since expired.

2.2 European Union Policy


2.2.1 The Waste Framework Directive provides the overarching legislative framework for the collection, transport, recovery and disposal of waste across Europe, including the UK, and was originally passed into law in 2006.

2.2.2 Article 16 of the Revised Waste Framework Directive refers to the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity. Paragraph 3 of Article 16 states:

The network shall enable waste to be disposed of or waste referred to in paragraph 1 to be recovered in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health.

2.2.3 Section 8 of the companion guide to PPS 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management highlights that Waste Planning Authorities have a key role in implementing the Waste Framework Directive in England, both through the determination of planning application for waste management facilities and through the preparation of development plans containing policies for waste, which form part of the waste disposal plan required under Article 7 of the Directive. It supports this by stating:

The Courts have held that an objective in the EU Waste Framework Directive is "...something different from a material consideration..." and "...must always be kept in mind when making a decision even while the decision maker has regard to other material considerations."
2.3 UK Policy

**National Planning Policy Framework**

2.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted at the end of March 2012 and is designed to consolidate policy statements, circulars and guidance documents into a single concise document. In line with the fundamentals of the waste hierarchy in developing waste reuse and recovery as a key compliance for waste treatment, the recently published NPPF holds sustainable development principles at its core.

2.3.2 The NPPF has been formulated as the guiding document that will shape the planning system in the future. The NPPF says at Paragraph 7 of its introduction that it does not contain specific waste policies 'since national waste planning policy will be published alongside the National Waste Management Plan for England'. However, paragraph 7 goes on to say that local authorities should have regard to the policies in the Framework in preparing their waste plans. While the NPPF does not include any express policies in relation to waste development, the general principles of the Framework should nevertheless be taken into account in the determination of this application.

2.3.3 In this case, the NPPF is clearly a material consideration in that it signals a new approach to the determination of planning applications and, in particular, a strong presumption in favour of sustainable development.

2.3.4 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF says that:

> At the heart of the planning system is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking...Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area...approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

2.3.5 **PPS 10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management** sets out the Government’s national policies on the different aspects of Sustainable Waste Management in England.

2.3.6 PPS10 advises waste planning authorities in deciding which sites to identify for waste management facilities, was planning authorities should;

(i) Assess their suitability for development against each of the following criteria:
- The extent to which they support the policies of this PPS;
- The physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses;
- The cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion or economic potential;
- The capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport.

(ii) Give priority to the re-use of previously developed land and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages.
2.3.7 Paragraph 3 of PPS 10 states that:

*Regional planning bodies and all planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, prepare and deliver planning strategies that:*

- Help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment, and enable waste to be **disposed of** in one of the nearest appropriate installations.

2.3.8 **The Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011** builds upon the waste hierarchy which was the core of the 2007 Waste Strategy for England. The key objectives are:

- Prioritise efforts to manage waste in line with the waste hierarchy and reduce the carbon impact of waste;
- Develop a range of measures to encourage waste prevention and reuse, supporting greater resource efficiency;
- Develop voluntary approaches to cutting waste, increase recycling, and improve the overall quality of recyclate material, working closely with business sectors and the waste and material resources industry.

2.3.9 Fundamental to the aims of the waste strategy is the waste hierarchy which aims to develop sustainable waste management, a key element of which is recycling, which turns waste into a resource.

![Waste Hierarchy Diagram]

**Regional Policy**

2.3.10 The East Midlands Regional Plan comprises the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands for the period up to 2026. With the introduction of the Local Development Plan Framework (LDF) the RSS had provided regional policies relating to proposed development.

2.3.11 In 2010 the UK Government abolished the strategies under s79(6) of the Local Democracy Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. In the Autumn of 2010 the High Court ruled that the Secretary of State’s decision to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) was unlawful as it had been taken without primary legislation. A statement was then issued by the Government reiterating their intention to remove Regional Spatial Strategies through the Localism Bill, and that this should be treated as a material consideration for planning applications. Despite a further legal challenge, it was confirmed that the Government’s intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies in a material consideration which should be taken into account when determining a planning application. A Commons Select Committee Report was published in Spring 2011 acknowledging the presence of a planning policy vacuum as a result.
2.3.12 The Localism Act (2011), in its ability to devolve greater powers to councils and
neighbourhoods and give local communities more control over planning decisions, will enable
the RSSs to be abolished.

Local Policy

2.3.13 The principle local planning policy is set out in the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste
Development Framework. A partial review of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste
Development Framework is currently underway.

Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Core Strategy DPD
(adopted May 2010)

2.3.14 The core strategy identifies Northamptonshire’s central spine and the sub-regional centre of
Daventry as the areas within which waste management development should be focused.

2.3.15 The key waste related objectives set out by the plan are as follows:

- Objective 1: Developing sustainable communities
- Objective 2: Sustainable minerals and waste development in Northamptonshire
- Objective 3: Promoting a clear investment framework
- Objective 5: Spatial distribution of waste development
- Objective 6: Efficient use and re-use of mineral resources
- Objective 11: Responsible stewardship through restoration

2.3.16 The following list of Core Strategy planning policies are considered to be relevant to the
proposed development.

Policy CS1: Northamptonshire’s waste management capacity

The development of a sustainable waste management network to support growth within
Northamptonshire will involve the provision of facilities to meet the following indicative waste
management capacities during the plan period:

- Inert recycling (C&D) capacity of 928,000 and 1,089,000 tonnes per annum for 2016
  and 2026 respectively.

This provision will come from a mix of extensions to existing sites, intensification or re-
development of existing sites and new sites, providing they all meet the spatial strategy for
waste management and are assessed as meeting environmental, amenity and other
requirements. Allocations that will contribute to meeting provision will be identified in the
Locations for Waste Development DPD.

Policy CS2: Spatial strategy for waste management

Northamptonshire’s waste management network, particularly advanced treatment facilities with
a sub-regional or wider catchment, will be focused within the central spine, and the sub-
regional centre of Daventry. Development should be concentrated in Northampton,
Wellingborough, Kettering, Corby and Daventry. Development in the smaller towns should be
consistent with their local service role. Facilities in urban areas should be co-located together
and with complementary activities.
Policy CS3: Strategy for waste disposal

Provisions should be made to meet the following indicative waste disposal capacities during the plan period:
- Inert fill disposal capacity of 693,000 and 813,000 tonnes per annum for 2016 and 2026 respectively.

Provision for inert waste disposal should be made at mineral extraction sites requiring restoration, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that an alternative location would not prejudice the restoration of these sites.

Policy CS9: Encourage sustainable transport movements

Minerals and waste related development should seek to minimise transport movements and maximise the use of sustainable or alternative transport modes.

Policy CS13: Restoration and after-use of minerals and waste development

All minerals and waste related development of a temporary nature must ensure that the site is progressively restored to an acceptable condition and stable landform.

The after-use of a site will be determined in relation to its land use context, the surrounding environment character and any specific local requirements, but on the basis that it:
- Enhances biodiversity and the local environment and amenity, and
- Benefits the local community and/or the local economy.

Policy CS14: Addressing the impact of proposed minerals and waste development

Proposals for minerals and waste development must demonstrate that the following matters have been addressed:
- Minimising environmental impact and protecting Northamptonshire’s key environmental designations,
- Protecting natural resources or ensuring that any unavoidable loss or reduction is mitigated,
- Ensuring built development is of a design and layout that has regard to its visual appearance in the context of the defining characteristics of the local area,
- Ensuring access is sustainable, safe and environmentally acceptable, and
- Ensuring that local amenity is protected.

2.3.17 Paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 relate to ‘Catchment areas for waste management’. Paragraph 4.16 states:

For reasons of sustainability, the movement on waste within the county and across its borders should ideally be kept to a minimum.

2.3.18 Section 9 of the Core Strategy concentrates on those strategic matters relating to minerals and waste development that are not concerned with provision and spatial strategy or with development criteria for particular types of minerals and waste development. Reference to secondary and recycled aggregates has been included within this section.
2.3.19 Paragraph 9.2 says that:

The promotion of sustainable development is a fundamental priority of spatial planning. For the purposes of Northamptonshire’s Core Strategy for minerals and waste planning there are three areas where there is to be a particular focus:
c) encouraging sustainable transport movements associated with minerals and waste related development

2.3.20 Paragraph 9.6 says that:

There is still greater opportunities to increase recycling rates; this is supported by the identification of targets for recycled aggregates in government guidance (MPS1).


2.3.21 The relationship between the Core Strategy and the Locations for Minerals Development DPD is very specific. This DPD acts to allocate sites in line with the spatial strategy for mineral extraction that will deliver the required provision; thus maintaining landbanks to ensure an adequate supply of aggregates for the construction industry over the plan period.

Policy M4: Sites for the provision of secondary and recycled materials

Facilities for the provision of secondary and recycled materials will be provided for by: sites with planning permission as of 1 January 2009, the following allocated site, and by any other site that comes forward in line with MWDF policies.

2.3.22 When considering this against the proposed development, it is noted that the chosen site for this development has not been identified as an allocated site. However, despite this Paragraph 3.3 of the MWDF states that:

The MWDF therefore attempts, in the interests of both flexibility and deliverability, to strike a balance between allocating sites and allowing non-allocated sites to come forward.


2.3.23 This document principally sets out locations for waste development within the county, under four distinct categories:

- Sites for integrated waste management facilities
- Sites for waste management use in or adjacent to urban areas
- Industrial area locations for waste management uses
- Sites for waste management use in rural areas

When considering this against the proposed development, it is noted that the chosen site for this development has not been identified as an allocated waste management site. However, despite this Paragraph 3.3 of the MWDF states that:

"The MWDF therefore attempts, in the interests of both flexibility and deliverability, to strike a balance between allocating sites and allowing non-allocated sites to come forward."

2.3.24 The Control and Management of Development DPD contains specific policies for controlling Minerals and Waste development in the county and complements the strategic visions and policies that are set out in the MWDF Core Strategy.

2.3.25 Policy CMD3: Proposals for the disposal or recovery of inert waste, where this does not relate to the restoration of a site identified in the Location for Mineral DPD, must demonstrate that:
   - It will not prejudice the restoration of mineral sites, and
   - There is clear engineering, agricultural, landscape, or recreation amenity justification for the development.

2.3.26 Policy CMD7: Natural assets and resources requires that (where possible) waste development should achieve a net gain in natural assets and resources, through:
   - Delivery of wider environmental benefits in the vicinity where development would adversely affect any regional or locally designated sites or other features of local interest;
   - Consider opportunities to contribute towards Northamptonshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets for habitats and species.

2.3.27 Policy CMD8: Landscape character requires that waste development should seek to reflect Northamptonshire's landscape character.

Waste development should mitigate potentially adverse impacts on the local character and distinctiveness of Northamptonshire's landscape where necessary during the development, operational life, restoration, aftercare, and after-use. Opportunities for enhancement should be maximised through restoration, aftercare, and after-use. Proposals will be required to undertake a landscape impact assessment to identify the potential impacts and any necessary mitigation measures.

2.3.28 Policy CMD1 within the DPD dictates the need to identify the likely catchment area of waste sources for specific waste facilities.

2.3.29 Paragraph 3.7 relating to the Catchment area of facilities states:

This approach recognises that cross-boundary movements are likely to occur but should be consistent with enabling waste to be managed as close to its source as possible, and kept to a minimum where possible.

2.3.30 This document is intended to provide an evidence base for local waste management needs to be incorporated into the partial review of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Framework. It refers to the following types of waste:

- Municipal solid (MSW)
- Commercial and industrial (C&I)
- Construction, demolition & excavation (CD&E) waste
- Hazardous
- Agricultural
- Radioactive wastes (in particular low level (LLW) and very low level (VLLW) radioactive wastes)

2.3.31 It states the following with reference to waste currently being produced in Northamptonshire: Northamptonshire currently produces 2.82 million tonnes (Mt) of various types of waste, this includes: 0.36 Mt of MSW (13%); 1.06 Mt of C&I waste (37%); 1.35 Mt of CD&E waste (48%); and 0.05 Mt of hazardous waste (2%). This waste is either disposed of to landfill or it is reused, recycled, composted, or recovered through other forms of treatment (e.g. anaerobic digestion, Energy from Waste, etc.).

2.3.32 These waste arising’s are set to increase over the next 20 years. It is estimated that 1.35 Mt CD&E waste is currently produced within Northamptonshire, of which 0.34 Mt is disposed of to landfill (including backfilling at quarries, and landfill engineering).

2.3.33 A significant proportion of CD&E will be recycled or re-used onsite and on registered exempt sites (e.g. as an engineering material in site road-making or as a restoration and cover material). The continuation of capacity will be needed in order for adequate provision to be made for this waste stream.

2.3.34 In line with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, the depositing of inert waste onto land may constitute recovery in some cases (where regulatory guidance is satisfied).

2.3.35 Section 3 identifies Northamptonshire’s current waste management capacity and indicative capacity requirements. Paragraph 3.11 states:

> The current permitted capacity for recycling, biological processing, inert recovery and clean fill, as well as hazardous treatment and landfill are sufficient to manage Northamptonshire’s waste arising’s up to the end of the plan period.
2.3.36 Tables 7 and 8 of this document highlight the indicative waste management and disposal capacity requirement as well as the indicative capacity gap.

Comment: Tables 7 and 8 above would suggest that there is a surplus of capacity for inert recovery within Northamptonshire. However, it should be noted that this permitted capacity for inert recovery within the County is at present not operational, therefore based on the applicants experience, there remains a shortfall in capacity for inert recovery within close proximity to Northampton.


2.3.37 This document provides practical guidance concerning all other forms of development (such as waste minimisation & management and preventing land use conflict), as well as those specific to minerals and waste development (such as catchment areas, design and restoration).

2.3.38 This SPD includes table SPD3 which indicates the proposed catchment area for facilities of differing scales. They are as follows:
Therefore, the majority of inert waste will have to originate within ‘Northamptonshire or an equivalent geographical area’, within an area of approximately 3,000 square kilometres, which could extend to include:

- Corby
- Market Harborough
- Desborough
- Rothwell
- Kettering
- Wellingborough
- Thrapston
- Oundle
- Stamford
- Oakham
- Peterborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment level</th>
<th>Covering the area of ...</th>
<th>Indicative area (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>England or an equivalent geographical area within Great Britain.</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>East Midlands or an equivalent geographical area.</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-regional</td>
<td>Northamptonshire or an equivalent geographical area.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Up to two adjacent LPA areas or an equivalent geographical area.</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

3.1.1 Across all levels of planning policy, the proposal for the revised restoration of a former minerals quarry and recycling of inert waste will fulfil a wide range of planning policy objectives, as set out previously.

3.2 Management of Waste - Location, Need & Capacity

3.2.1 Policy CS1 of the Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy states that there is a capacity requirement for inert recycling within the county of up to 1,08 million tonnes per annum between 2016 and 2026. It explains that this provision can come from new sites, providing they meet the spatial strategy for waste management and are assessed as meeting environmental, amenity and other requirements.

3.2.2 When considering this proposal against the relevant planning policy, it is noted that the chosen site for this development has not been identified as an allocated waste development site or for minerals related development. However, despite this Paragraph 3.3 of the MWDF - Locations for Waste Development DPD states that:

The MWDF therefore attempts, in the interests of both flexibility and deliverability, to strike a balance between allocating sites and allowing non-allocated sites to come forward.

3.2.3 This would indicate that where reasonable and justified, there is scope for permission to be granted to facilities for the provision of secondary and recycled materials which have not previously been allocated within the MWDF.

3.2.4 The criterion for establishing suitable locations for waste development has been set out in the Locations for Waste Development DPD. It identifies four distinct categories:

- Sites for integrated waste management facilities
- Sites for management use in or adjacent to urban areas
- Industrial area locations for waste management uses
- Sites for waste management in rural areas

3.2.5 When assessing the above categories, it can be considered that the Application Site is that of an integrated waste management facility due to the combination of inert waste recycling and disposal. Therefore in light of this, it should be considered as a suitable location for both inert recycling and inert recovery.

3.2.6 Policy CS2 of the Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy outlines the spatial strategy for waste management within the county. It states that the county’s waste management network will be focused within the central spine of the county which covers areas such as Northampton, Wellingborough, Kettering, Corby and Daventry.

3.2.7 As the proposed development is located within close proximity to Northampton, it can therefore be regarded as being located within the central spine of the county which is where Policy CS2 states that Northamptonshire’s waste management network should be focused. This would therefore support the location of the proposed development for the recovery and recycling of inert waste within Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond.
3.2.8 Policy CS9 of the Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy seeks to encourage sustainable transport movements. Paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 of the Northamptonshire MWDF Core Strategy relate to ‘Catchment areas for waste management’. Paragraph 4.16 states:

For reasons of sustainability, the movement of waste within the county and across its borders should ideally be kept to a minimum.

3.2.9 This is again addressed in paragraph 9.2 of the Core Strategy where it explains that the promotion of sustainable development is a fundamental priority of spatial planning and for those purposes focus should be placed on encouraging sustainable transport movements associated with minerals and waste related development.

3.2.10 Therefore it could be considered that in terms of sustainability, as the applicant’s main waste stream comes from Northampton, the proposed development can be regarded as encouraging sustainable transport movements through the management of waste as close to its source as possible therefore reducing the need to transport waste around the county. Whilst the proximity principle no longer exists in relevant UK Planning Policy documents, the purpose of catchment areas for waste management is in effect a method of achieving the same outcome as the proximity principle.

3.2.11 The proposed inert recycling operations within Pitsford Quarry should be deemed as making a positive contribution towards reducing the requirement capacity as set out in Policy CS1.

3.2.12 The proposed recycling activities aim to reduce the amount of inert waste going to landfill by promoting the recycling and reuse of inert waste. All mixed inert waste entering Pitsford Quarry will be screened and where possible recycled to produce recycled aggregates for re-sale at market. Therefore, utilising waste through recycling will divert it away from landfill.

3.2.13 The ‘Local assessment of waste management needs’ was released in December 2012 to inform the plan making process in relation to the current situation and future waste planning requirements, such as capacity requirements and provision of waste management facilities for the plan period 2011-2031.

3.2.14 Within this assessment it indicates that the waste arising in Northamptonshire is set to increase over the next 20 years. It estimates that 1.35 million tonnes of construction, demolition and excavation waste is currently produced within Northamptonshire, of which 0.34 million tonnes is disposed of to landfill (including backfilling at quarries, and landfill engineering).

3.2.15 It recognises that the continuation of capacity will be needed in order for adequate provision to be made for this waste stream.

3.2.16 Section 3 of this waste management needs assessment identifies Northamptonshire’s current waste management capacity and indicative capacity requirements. It acknowledges that the current permitted capacity for waste management is sufficient to manage Northamptonshire’s waste arising’s up to the end of the plan period.

3.2.17 The assessment indicates that there is a surplus of 0.23 million tonnes of permitted capacity within Northamptonshire for inert recovery/clean fill however, it should be noted that this capacity for inert recovery is capacity which has been permitted therefore it does not necessarily mean that these permissions have been implemented which is acknowledged in footnote 9 of the local needs assessment which states:
Permitted capacity may be significantly different from the operational capacity due to permissions not being implemented, market constraints etc.

3.2.18 Information supplied by the applicant would indicate that the current operational capacity within Northamptonshire is significantly different from the permitted capacity as set out in the local needs assessment.

3.2.19 The applicant has identified 6 operational inert disposal facilities within Northamptonshire:

- Harlestone Quarry – 4 miles from Northampton
- Northampton Shooting Ground, Sywell – 8 miles from Northampton
- Pury End – 10 miles from Northampton
- Sidegate Lane – 15 miles from Northampton
- Long Drowpits – 18 miles from Northampton
- Lilford Lodge – 28 miles from Northampton

3.2.20 Whilst it is acknowledged that there are various facilities for inert disposal within Northamptonshire, the sites closest to Northampton all of operating restrictions. As demonstrated earlier within this report, the remaining void at Harlestone Quarry is due to be fill over the coming months. The Northampton Shooting Ground primarily focuses on inert recycling operations and has not received inert material for 18 months. Pury end has limited inert fill capacity and is shut during the winter months.

3.2.21 The applicant is unsure of the fill capacity at Sidegate Lane however, does not expect that it will be sufficient to meet the expected volumes of inert waste requiring disposal over the coming years in the county. The applicant accepts that whilst Long Drowpits and Lilford Lodge are operational inert disposal facilities, their distance from the source of inert waste does not make them commercially viable alternatives.

3.2.22 The above assessment of the operational capacity within Northamptonshire would demonstrate that there is a need for additional capacity to deal with inert waste.

3.2.23 This would indicate a need to give weight to the proximity principle for the management of inert waste arising’s from development in around Northampton. The proximity principle avoids passing the environmental costs of waste management to communities which are not responsible for its generation, and reduces the environmental and financial costs of transporting waste.

3.3 Prejudice of Mineral Sites Requiring Restoration

3.3.1 Policy CS3 of the MWDF Core Strategy indicates that provisions should be made for inert fill disposal capacity of between 693,000 and 813,000 tonnes per annum for the duration of the plan period. However, it can be assumed that this figure has been superseded by the figures produced within the Local waste management needs assessment released in December 2021 which indicate that there is a surplus of permitted capacity within Northamptonshire.

3.3.2 Notwithstanding this, as it has been demonstrated above there is a shortfall in operational capacity within Northamptonshire for inert waste which would indicate that provisions for additional inert fill capacity would be encouraged by the Waste Planning Authority.
3.3.3 In compliance with Policies CS3 and CMD3 it has been demonstrated that the proposed
development will not prejudice the restoration of other mineral extraction sites requiring
restoration, most notably Harlestone Quarry. Due to the lack of operational inert fill capacity
within Northamptonshire, the remaining void at Harlestone Quarry is expected to be filled by
summer 2013 therefore leaving operators without a suitable location for inert fill disposal within
close proximity to Northampton.

3.4 Environmental Assessment

3.4.1 Policy CMD3 also requires proposals for disposal or recovery of inert waste to demonstrate that
there is reasonable justification for the development. The revised restoration of Pitsford Pond
seeks to restore the site to a condition which is in keeping with the surrounding landscape.

3.4.2 The revised restoration an agricultural after-use not only provides a range of environmental
benefits as outlined in section 1.7.12 to 1.7.15 but also addresses a number of public concerns
as mentioned in paragraphs 1.7.16 to 1.7.18. The proposed soil bund along the haul road and
Pitsford Pond area would contribute towards protecting the general amenity of the nearby
residential properties located south of the Pond area.

3.4.3 Policy CMD7 highlights the need to consider opportunities to contribute towards
Northamptonshire’s natural assets and resources. A Restoration and 5 Year Aftercare scheme
details the revised restoration programme of the site, it is detailed in appendix 5. Deliberate
steps have been undertaken within the design of the revised restoration scheme to ensure that
the development will bring environmental and biodiversity enhancement to its locality.

3.4.4 Policy CMD8 identifies the need for Minerals and waste development should seek to reflect
Northamptonshire’s landscape character. The proposed revised restoration of the former
minerals site will return the application site to a form which is in keeping with the surrounding
local Moulton Slopes landscape area.

3.4.5 In compliance with Policy CMD13 the application site which historically comprised of agriculture
land and then worked for the extraction of minerals, will be restored back to high grade
agriculture land.

3.4.6 The revised restoration of Pitsford Pond will also provide considerable wildlife enhancement.
The new areas of wetland and hedgerow are priority habitats within the local biodiversity action
plan. The new areas of woodland, scrub and grass margins will contribute towards supporting
the target species set out in the local biodiversity action plan.

3.4.7 Compliance of Planning Policy CS14 of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development
Framework requires all developments to be considered environmentally acceptable and
therefore to address the impact of proposed minerals and waste development.

**Traffic and Transport**

3.4.8 Access to the site will be from the existing entry point to Pitsford Quarry on the A508,
Harborough Road which connects with Northampton to the south and Market Harborough to
the north.
3.4.9 When Pitsford Quarry was fully operational it produced up to 120,000 tonnes per annum of material which resulted in 48 vehicle movements per day.

\[
\text{(120,000 tonnes per annum / 250 working days / 20 tonnes)}
\]

3.4.10 Pitsford Quarry has remained unused for several years and therefore does not generate any vehicle movements. It is expected however, that the proposed activities will generate a similar amount of traffic movements as when Pitsford Quarry was fully operational.

3.4.11 It is expected that 85,000 tonnes per annum of clean, mixed inert waste will be imported into Pitsford Quarry. Therefore this would generate 17 in-bound vehicle movements per day.

\[
\text{(85,000 tonnes per annum / 250 working days / 20 tonnes)}
\]

3.4.12 Assuming that 25,000 tonnes of material will be suitable for recycling to produce recycled aggregates which will be transported off-site to be sold, it can be expected that this would generate 5 out-bound vehicle movements per day using vehicles delivering inert waste to the site. This then leaves 60,000 tonnes of inert waste to be transported to Pitsford Pond as part of the infilling and revised restoration process.

3.4.13 The further extraction of stone from Pitsford Quarry is expected to amount to 50,000 tonnes per annum which would result in 20 vehicle movements per day.

\[
\text{(50,000 tonnes per annum / 250 working days / 20 tonnes)}
\]

3.4.14 The combined activities would generate up to 54 vehicle movements per day. This represents the worst case, as it is likely that much of the stone will be taken off-site in back loads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation(s)</th>
<th>Vehicle Movements Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importation of mixed inert waste</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-sale of recycled aggregates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Extraction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicle Movements Per Day</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.17 Despite an additional 6 vehicle movements per day to the vehicle movements which represented the previous operational arrangements of the Pitsford Quarry, it is not expected that the proposed development will give rise to any significant effects in respect to traffic movements. It is regarded that the surrounding highway network has suitable capacity to support the volume of traffic movements as a result of the proposed development.

3.4.18 Access to Pitsford Quarry consists of a tarmaced surface wide enough for two vehicles to pass. Access to Pitsford Pond will consist of an extension of the haul road from Pitsford Quarry across an adjoining piece of land which will connect to Pitsford Pond. This haul road will be made up using hardcore material from Pitsford Quarry.
**Ecology**

3.4.19 A Phase 1 Habitat Survey with further surveys for winter birds and badgers has been undertaken by Conservation Constructions Ltd and is included in Appendix 2.

3.4.20 Anecdotal and preliminary survey results show that Pitsford Pond includes a number of non-native species, some of which are on the Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 9 and therefore are subject to control to prevent their release into the wider environment. Eradication of these species to enable use of the site for inert landfill, subject to planning, is likely to be met favourably by the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust.

3.4.21 The Environment Agency will require the Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 9 coarse fish and other Schedule 9 species, including Parrot’s feather and Nuttall’s/Canadian pondweeds to be destroyed on site.

3.4.22 Kingfisher was seen at the Pitsford Pond site, which prompted the need for a survey to be carried out to locate any possible nesting birds. This survey failed to locate any areas of nesting.

3.4.23 Sand Martin nest sites were found within Pitsford Quarry; the colony is only small and may have only recently started to use the site. The nest site should be retained, however, if this is not possible replacement sand martin towers will be created in suitable locations in the quarry area prior to the birds returning in March/April as shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan.

3.4.24 Badger activity was recorded within both Pitsford Pond and Pitsford Quarry areas; however a badger survey revealed no setts were found.

3.4.25 Great Crested Newts were not found to be present within Pitsford Quarry and are extremely unlikely to be found within Pitsford Pond, due to the presence of fish.

3.4.26 The site is likely to support terrestrial invertebrates but species present are also likely to use the west and south margins of the adjacent arable field and an area of similar native species habitat in the south west corner of the arable field. It is proposed that retention of these areas will ensure the survival of any species present.

3.4.27 Following recent correspondence with the Senior Environmental Planner of Northamptonshire County Council, the applicant was requested to consider undertaking a survey for terrestrial invertebrates in order to avoid impacts on Species of Principal Importance and Biodiversity Action Plan species and also further over-wintering bird surveys.

3.4.28 After taking advice from a qualified ecologist and government guidance, a decision was taken not to undertake a Terrestrial Invertebrate survey as it is unlikely that there is a reasonable likelihood of these species being present and affected by the development.

3.4.29 This is further supported by paragraph 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation states:

> Developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development.
3.4.30 Despite this, a number of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, which shows various areas within the local wildlife site to be designated for the protection of particular species. As shown on the drawing, areas will be fenced off for retention of bare ground as so to create a suitable habitat for invertebrates.

3.4.31 The further over-wintering bird survey undertaken by Conservation Constructions (see appendix 9) concludes by saying:

*It is unlikely that the loss of the scrub on the Pitsford Pond site and the operation of the landfill will adversely impact on over-wintering birds.*

*In summary, the activity associated with the landfill site, including the sorting and recycling of materials in the quarry is unlikely to disturb wintering birds any more than operating the quarry and the use of agricultural machinery on adjacent fields.*

3.4.32 At the time of Ecological Assessment in 1997 (in connection with the ROMP review) the survey found 4 larger trees within field boundary hedgerows with potential to provide bat roosts. None of these trees have been affected by the quarrying operations. The proposed operations will be undertaken during daylight hours when bat species are inactive.

**Proposed Biodiversity Mitigation**

3.4.33 Within Northamptonshire's MWDF Control and Management of Development DPD, paragraph 5.53 states:

*Minerals and waste developments have the potential to make a significant contribution to a number of BAP species and habitat targets. For some specific habitats, the entire creation target for the county could be achieved through appropriate restoration of minerals development.*

3.4.34 The proposed Restoration and 5 year Aftercare Scheme (Appendix 5) provides in line with current national and local biodiversity plans. The revised restoration scheme for Pitsford Pond includes:

- Creation of a new wetland to the naturally low-lying south-west corner of the site, together with a small area of rough grassland and associated shrubs.
- Planting of 147m of new native hedgerow along the northern boundary in the earliest available planting season.
- Restoration of 225m of dry stone wall running along the western boundary which is a suitable habitat for invertebrates, common lizards and grass snakes.
- Planting of 3 small areas of native trees and shrubs.
- Planting of 11 individual native trees alongside the public footpath to the east of the site.
- Creation of 6m wide grass headlands to provide habitat for birds, mammals and invertebrates.
- A small amount of broadleaved weeds will be allowed to establish, creating a habitat for hares, small mammals, ground nesting and feeding birds and invertebrates.
3.4.35 It is also proposed that over the following two winters, the scrub around the two ponds on T’s Wood would be cleared to reinstate a suitable habitat for Great Crested Newts.

3.4.36 As shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, areas will be fenced off for retention of bare ground as so to create a suitable habitat for invertebrates. Also shown on the same drawing, areas of artificial nests will be created for the sand martins identified within the quarry.

**Flood Risk**

3.4.37 Within Northamptonshire’s MWDF Control and Management of Development DPD, paragraph 5.57 states:

*Restoration of mineral sites may present opportunities for improvement to flood risk management, for example making space for water by improving flood flow routes and/or providing flood storage. Surface water run-off rates following restoration should be limited to the pre-extraction or pre-development rates, and where possible seek to improve rates (thereby reducing flood risk). Such measures will help to ensure that flood risk off-site is not increased.*

3.4.38 A Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared by Abington Consulting Engineers and is included in Appendix 3.

3.4.39 It states that as there are no proposals to change the nature of the quarry floor, there will be no change in the run-off rates and any surface water is expected to percolate into the ground as it does at present.

3.4.40 Potential flooding from groundwater has also been considered within the report. Section 6.2.1 states:

*Pitsford Quarry has been operated for several years with no particular problem encountered in terms of flooding from groundwater owing to the permeable geology and low water table.*

3.4.41 Prior to restoring Pitsford Pond, it will need to be dewatered, which will be achieved by pumping water out and into an infiltration basin at the south western end of the Pitsford Pond site, which will eventually be used for the restoration drainage. Section 6.2.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment states that:

*Groundwater ingress will need to be considered when dewatering the pond.*

3.4.42 There will be no off-site impacts from the development as a result of the proposed management of surface water run-off.

3.4.43 The proposed ditch and infiltration basin should be inspected annually to ensure they are free from blockages and any remedial works carried out as necessary.

3.4.44 The Flood Risk Assessment concludes that management of restoration drainage will ensure that run-off rates do not pose a flood risk to the nearby watercourse.

**Hydrogeology**
3.4.45 A Hydrogeological Impact Assessment has been prepared by Hafren Water and is included in Appendix 4.

3.4.46 The assessment considers the potential impacts on the water environment arising from the proposed development. It includes a detailed assessment of the baseline conditions in relation to the water environment at Pitsford Pond and its surroundings, any potential impacts of the proposed development and also appropriate mitigation measures for any identified potential impacts.

3.4.47 The assessment indicates that the site is not located within an SPZ and there are no groundwater abstractions, or private water supplies, down-gradient of the site. In addition, the extent of the aquifer down-gradient of the site is limited and the underlying impermeable base of the unit crops out south and west of the site.

3.4.48 The assessment has considered the potential impacts on groundwater after restoration, it states:

*The replacement of the open water in the pond by relatively low permeability material is likely to reduce the flow of groundwater through the site. This may result in a slight rise in groundwater level up-gradient (to the northeast) of the site and a fall down-gradient. As groundwater levels are over 6 mbgl and there are no sensitive sites in the vicinity, the impact of any rise is considered to be 'negligible' with a significance of 'none'.*

**Landscape and Visual Amenity**

**Landscape Character**

3.4.49 In England, a hierarchy exists from the broad scale national character assessment at the top tier, through regional and county scale assessments to those at the district scale. At the most detailed level, site specific landscape character assessments are undertaken. Each level in the hierarchy should, in principal, add detail to the layer above, with the broader scale assessment providing a context and framework.

3.4.50 In April 2003, the Built and Natural Environment Service of Northamptonshire County Council appointed LDA Design to carry out a Current Landscape Character Assessment of Northamptonshire.

3.4.51 Each level in the hierarchy is considered in turn.

**National Scale Character Area**

3.4.52 The application site is located within Countryside Character Area 95: Northamptonshire Uplands. The Northamptonshire Uplands are noted for the following key characteristics:

- Rounded, undulating hills with many long, low ridgelines.
- Abundant and prominent ridge and furrow with frequent deserted and shrunken settlements.
- Sparse settlement of nucleated villages on hilltops or valley heads.
- Mixed farming: open arable contrasts with pasture enclosed by good hedges with frequent hedgerow trees.
Wide views from the edges and across the ridgetops.
Straight, wide, enclosure roads, often following ridges.
Little woodland, but prominent coverts on higher ground.
Ironstone and limestone older buildings with a transition across the area. Brick buildings in some villages.
Great variety of landform with distinctive local features like Hemplow Hills.
Large and nationally-important historic parks.

District and Local Scale Character Area

Northamptonshire Landscape Characterisation Project Current Landscape Character Assessment

3.4.53 At the district scale a landscape character assessment was undertaken for Northamptonshire, known as the Northamptonshire Landscape Characterisation Project. The site is located within the Ironstone Landscapes, Rolling Ironstone Valley Slopes Landscape Character Type and 4b Moulton Slopes Landscape Character Area.

3.4.54 The key characteristics of the Rolling Ironstone Valley Slopes Landscape Character Type are:
- Broad valley slopes dissected by numerous tributary streams.
- Ironstone geology expressed in local vernacular buildings and in rich red soils.
- Rolling landform, extensive views and sense of exposure on some prominent locations.
- Steep slopes adjacent to more elevated landscapes.
- Numerous water bodies including the county’s largest reservoir.
- Productive arable farmland in medium and large scale fields predominates on elevated land although sheep and cattle pastures are prevalent, often in smaller fields adjacent to watercourses.
- Agricultural practices create a patchwork of contrasting colours and textures extending across valley slopes.
- Where broadleaved woodlands and mature hedgerows combine, these inform a sense of a well treed landscape.
- Hedgerows generally low and well clipped although intermittent sections show evidence of decline.
- Well settled with numerous villages and towns.
- Landscapes directly and indirectly influenced by the close proximity of many of the county’s urban areas; and
- Building materials vary although vernacular architecture and churches display the local ironstone.

3.4.55 The Moulton Slopes Landscape Character Area is described as follows:

The Moulton Slopes Character Area is located to the north of Northampton. It comprises a broad valley, through which flows the Sedge Brook, a tributary of the Brampton Valley, and a smaller watercourse, which flows southwards into Northampton to the west of Overstone. From the upper slopes of the valley, wide views across rolling farmland are possible. From the slopes above Moulton, views southwards to Northampton are largely screened by vegetation and landform. However, tall urban elements such as the Express Lifts Tower are prominent features punctuating the skyline.
The landscape is relatively well settled, with the villages of Boughton, Moulton and Overstone lying along the winding road that runs along the southern slopes of the Sedge Brook Valley.
Pitsford is also located within the character area. This small village is situated on the watershed between Pitsford Water and the valley of the Sedge Brook.
Land cover is typically arable farmland, although improved and semi improved pastures are more dominant along lower valley slopes and along watercourses. Woodland cover is low, although significant areas of deciduous woodland can be found in the vicinity of Overstone.

Landscape Designations

3.4.56 Boughton Hall, which is Grade II, listed on the Register of Historic Parks and Garden, lies to the south-west of the site. The western boundary of the registered area marked by the A508, Boughton Hall comprises early 18th Century gardens and pleasure grounds, set within parkland greatly reworked in the second half of the 18th Century by William Wentworth, second Earl of Strafford. To the west and north-west lie the Althorp Estate (Grade II*) and Holdenby House (Grade I and a Scheduled Ancient Monument), respectively. Both these are greater than 5km from the site.

3.4.57 In 2011, Pitsford Quarry was designated by the Wildlife Trust as a Local Wildlife Site which is a non-statutory designation. Also within the north-east of the Quarry area is a Local Geological Site.

3.4.58 North of the site, approximately 3.75km is Pitsford Water, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Country Park.

3.4.59 Approximately 1.5km south-west of the site is the Boughton Bowl Barrow Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Boughton bowl barrow lies on the west side of Boughton Village, just to the south of the road which runs from Boughton Hall to Boughton Mill. This Bronze Age bowl barrow consists of a round mound standing 2m high and 20m in diameter. Remains of a ditch approximately 2m wide can be traced around the barrow mound. Trees and grass cover the barrow, which lies unploughed in a cultivated field.

3.4.60 It is judged that the potential impact of the proposed development on landscape designations within the area is negligible. This is due to the location of the proposed development and the presence of intervening topography and vegetation between the site and the designated areas.

3.4.61 It is regarded that the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond will return the former mineral workings back to a landform which is in keeping with the surrounding landscape.

3.4.62 The site is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), a National Park, Green Belt, or subject to other statutory designations.

Visual Amenity

3.4.63 Pitsford Quarry and Pond is located on the upper slopes of the Brampton Valley. It is a relatively prominent topographical location at the Northampton Urban fringe. The quarry fringes are bordered on all sides by mature vegetation, principally native mixed hedgerow with hedgerow trees and blocks of woodland to the north and west. This provides significant visual screening. In addition, the majority of the proposed development is located at the base of Pitsford Quarry and at lower levels within Pitsford Pond, with the exception of the proposed haul road connecting Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond.

Visual Receptors
3.4.64 Visual Receptors are those groups who are most likely to be affected by a change in the visual amenity as a result of the proposed development. The following potential receptors are considered:

- Users of the local highway network
- Users of the local public right of way network
- Residents

3.4.65 It is considered that due to the presence of intervening topography and vegetation there will be a negligible impact on the visual amenity of the majority of these receptor groups however, as mentioned previously, a soil bund will be constructed along the length of the haul road and Pitsford Pond area as so to screen the on-site operations from the nearby residential properties.

**Operational Period**

3.4.66 The operational period for the proposed development is defined by the combined operations of infilling Pitsford Pond and recycling and excavation activities within Pitsford Quarry.

3.4.67 All activities based within Pitsford Quarry will not be visible from the identified visual receptors and therefore will have a negligible impact on the visual amenity. Infilling activities within Pitsford Pond and the movement of inert material from Pitsford Quarry to Pitsford Pond will be visible from all of the visual receptors identified, however visual intrusion will be minimal due to the planting of additional vegetation and placing of a soil bund along the proposed haul road and within Pitsford Pond.

3.4.68 The visual presence of the proposed development within the local environment is very limited and the impact of the visual amenity of the locality and identified receptor groups is considered to be negligible.

**Revised Restoration and Aftercare scheme**

3.4.69 As required by Policies CMD7 and CMD13 a Restoration and 5 Year Aftercare Report has been produced to ensure that the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond will be in-keeping with the locality, providing high grade agricultural land, with landscape and biodiversity benefits.

3.4.70 The infilling of Pitsford Pond will allow for the land to be brought back into agricultural use. In addition to the use of the land for agriculture, the development will also incorporate a range of planting and ecological enhancement measures.

3.4.71 During the aftercare period an Annual Aftercare report will be submitted detailing the restoration and aftercare operations which have taken place, and those which are scheduled up to 12 months ahead. This is to be submitted prior to 31st September of every year during the aftercare period once most of the annual maintenance has been completed.

3.4.72 The Revised Restoration and Aftercare Scheme includes aspects such as soil placement, seeding, maintenance and habitat aftercare. Details can be found within Appendix 5.
**General Amenity**

**Dust**

3.4.73 The nature of the process of tipping and grading the fill in Pitsford Pond and recycling operations in Pitsford Quarry.

3.4.74 The recycling operations will be contained by existing bunds around the quarry margins and by their location in the quarry floor. As a result, dust blown during dry weather is unlikely to affect any residential properties. The nearest residence at The Oaks is 200m away and is fully screened by intervening bunds and landform.

3.4.75 The filling of Pitsford Pond will largely be below ground level. Only when soil placement takes place on the fill surface will there be a risk of dust being blown beyond the site boundaries. The nearest properties in the Bunkers Hill complex are 160m away and located to the south-east. They would only be affected if the wind were blowing from the north-west. Soil operations would cease in the event of dust blowing toward these properties.

3.4.76 It is proposed that a Dust Monitoring and Management Scheme will be agreed prior to development commencing and implemented throughout the lifespan of the operations.

**Noise**

3.4.77 A Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared by Noise & Vibration Consultants Ltd and is included in Appendix 6.

3.4.78 The working processes may have the potential to have an effect on the surrounding area in terms of noise. A noise assessment has been undertaken to determine the noise impact at the nearest residential receptors relative to the proposed site.

3.4.79 Noise levels have been considered and assessed during the operational phase of the proposed development. Relevant and appropriate noise guidance and standards together with existing noise conditions for the site have been used to determine the noise impact.

3.4.80 The noise assessment concludes the following:

*The resultant highest likely predicted noise levels for all site operations are below the NPPF limits (whereby the noise levels do not exceed background noise level +10dB(A) or the absolute limit of 55dB(A) Leq,1hr).*

*The resultant highest likely predicted noise level is shown to meet the existing planning consent conditions for Pitsford Quarry activities.*

*The cumulative effect of the recycling, mineral extraction and infilling operations during the daytime periods with HGV and mobile plant movement shows that the site could work within reasonable limits, based on the assumed operating plant and proposed noise mitigation measures.*

*The assessment of site traffic demand concludes that there would be a minor impact magnitude onto the A508 Harborough Road based on a peak hour traffic flow and therefore no significant change in highway noise conditions is expected as a result of the development.*
Mud

3.4.81 A wheelwash will be located within the site compound which will prevent mud from being carried out of the access, however the possible occurrence of mud on the public highway will be dealt with by deploying a sweeper to keep the highway clean.

Rights of Way

3.4.82 There are two public rights of way in the vicinity of the Pitsford Pond site as shown on drawing GPP-PB-PP-12-02. Public Right of Way CC2 is located west of Pitsford Pond and PROW CC13 is located along the outside eastern boundary of Pitsford Pond; the latter not expected to be affected.

3.4.83 Public Right of Way CC2 will be crossed by HGV’s and plant machinery transporting inert material between Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond. In order to maintain the Public Rights of Way and ensure the continued safety of users, suitable signage, fencing and crossing points will be put in place.
4 CONSULTATION

4.1.1 Prior to submitting the Planning Application, local residents were notified of the intention to submit a Planning Application for proposed development at Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond. Details of which can be found within Appendix 7.

4.1.2 A public meeting was arranged with the Pitsford Liaison Committee and local residents with the main purpose of the meeting to introduce the development proposals and to answer and questions which may be raised.

4.1.3 The public meeting, held on Monday 21st January at the local Griffin Inn, was well attended by a number of statutory and non-statutory stakeholders. As part of the event, a PowerPoint presentation was delivered which described the proposed development. Following this questions were invited from those present and answered by the various members of the development team.

4.1.4 The main concerns raised by those present included:

- Increased Traffic Volumes along A508 and through Pitsford Village
- Flood Risk
- General Amenity Impacts upon Pitsford Village (Noise, Dust and Visual)
- Loss of leisure facility
- Proximity to local schools

4.1.5 It is accepted that consultation with the community, Northamptonshire County and Statutory Consultees is an on-going process. As a result, the applicant is prepared to engage with the local liaison committee on a regular basis to discuss and resolve any issues which may arise as a result of the proposed development.

4.1.6 On Monday 18th February, a meeting was held with a local representative of the Wildlife Trust to discuss the designation of Pitsford Quarry as a local wildlife site and the future management of it. It was agreed within the meeting that areas within Pitsford Quarry would be fenced off and retained to provide a suitable habitat for those invertebrates likely to be present on site. These areas are shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/06 Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan.
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 This planning statement has been prepared on behalf of Peter Bennie Ltd to supplement a planning application for the proposals associated with the infilling and revised restoration of Pitsford Pond, a site of previous mineral working. Proposals include:
- The importation of up to 85,000 tonnes per annum of clean inert materials at Pitsford Quarry, with the screening and segregation of mixed loads.
- Inert recycling of up to 25,000 tonnes per annum within Pitsford Quarry and removal off site.
- Inert disposal of 170,000 tonnes of clean inert waste at Pitsford Pond, at a rate of 60,000 tonnes per annum.
- Revised restoration of Pitsford Pond to agricultural afteruse.

5.1.2 This work will be carried out alongside a resumption of stone extraction from Phase 1 of Pitsford Quarry.

5.1.3 This planning statement and a range of supporting documents demonstrate the nature of the proposed development, its compliance with national and local planning policy and provides detailed analysis of any potential impacts on the environment.

5.2 Conclusion

5.2.1 The reason why planning permission should be granted are as follows:
- Compliance with Local Planning Policy
- Compliance with National Planning Policy
- Available capacity for disposal of inert waste
- Biodiversity and Landscape enhancement
- Revised restoration of former mineral workings to a beneficial agriculture use.

5.2.2 In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the proposed development is compliant with the relevant national and local planning policies, there will be no detrimental impact on the environment as a result of the development and there will be long-term environmental benefits. In light of the above, it is concluded that there are no known reasons why this planning application should not be considered favourably by the local planning authority.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Planning Application

1.1.1 A planning application was submitted to Northamptonshire County Council on behalf of Peter Bennie Ltd in February 2013. It seeks to gain permission for a revised restoration scheme for Pitsford Pond with associated inert recycling operations at Pitsford Quarry. These works would be carried out alongside further extraction of the Northampton Sand Ironstone mineral reserve in Phase 1 at Pitsford Quarry.

1.1.2 This report provides additional information in response to queries and/or concerns raised through the formal consultation process, including the impact of noise, dust management, dewatering of Pitsford Pond and ecological mitigation.

1.2 Site Location & Sensitive Receptors

1.2.1 A revised site location plan is included in Appendix 1, which is based on a more up-to-date OS base, showing Pitsford Pond in the correct location.

1.2.2 Around the application area, there are five residential properties/complexes that lie within close proximity. They are as follows:

- Home Farm – Approx. 70m from access road
- The Oaks – Approx. 190m from boundary of quarry area
- The bungalow at the Oaks – Approx. 180m from boundary of quarry compound area
- Fox Covert Farm complex – Approx. 200m from boundary of quarry area
- Bunkers Hill Farm complex – Approx. 130m from boundary of Pitsford Pond and proposed haul road area

1.3 Ecology

1.3.1 It was suggested by Natural England that the Applicant should provide commentary on habitat management carried out on the site to date, the current qualities of terrestrial habitat surrounding any historic Great Crested Newt breeding ponds, and what proposals exist to continue managing this habitat, with a view to increasing any remnant populations or offering a suitable habitat for any Great Crested Newts within a wider meta-population which might re-colonise the site.

1.3.2 Within Appendix 2, additional information has been prepared by Conservation Constructions Ltd in response to comments provided by Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England.

1.3.3 A revised Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan has been included within Appendix 2.

1.4 Traffic Routing

1.4.1 A routing agreement is offered as part of the development proposals in order to control the movement of Heavy Goods Vehicles entering and exiting the site.
1.4.2 In order to protect residential amenity, it is proposed that all Heavy Goods Vehicles will avoid the use of roads through nearby villages such as Pitsford and Boughton, unless when instructed to do otherwise by the Site Operator in connection with local deliveries or collections.

1.4.3 Instructions will be provided to all HGV operators prior to arriving on site to inform them of the routing agreement.

1.4.4 HGV's will be required to utilise the site weighbridge prior to exiting the site. Posters detailing the routing agreement will be hung in the weighbridge office along with a verbal instruction provided by the weighbridge operator.

1.5 Timescales

1.5.1 As demonstrated within paragraph 1.6.18 of Planning Statement V3, the waste receipts provided to the Environment Agency has indicated that for the year 2012, 65,000m$^3$ of inert waste was received by Harlestone Quarry for disposal.

1.5.2 In order to fully restore Pitsford Pond, 100,000m$^3$ of inert waste is required. Assuming the level of input remains the same as the 2012 records for Harlestone Quarry, then Pitsford Pond will only approximately 1.5 years to complete. The Applicant envisages that the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond can be completed within the 3 years applied for.

1.6 Inert Recycling

1.6.1 It has been suggested throughout many of the written representations made by non-statutory consultees, that the inert recycling component of the proposed development can be undertaken elsewhere at sites such as Boughton Quarry and Harlestone Quarry and that there is no requirement for it to be undertaken in association with the revised restoration of Pitsford Pond.

1.6.2 Notwithstanding this, it is considered standard practice in the minerals and waste industry that where inert fill is required for land restoration, inert recycling operations are undertaken alongside to recover any hardcore material from loads where it is mixed with other inert material suitable for recycling. This provides a much more efficient and economically beneficial process for the site operator.

1.6.3 A benefit of co-location is that the double handling of material and additional HGV vehicle movements between sites can be reduced.

1.7 Noise

1.7.1 Within Appendix 3, additional information has been prepared by NVC Ltd to consider the impact of noise from various activities associated with the proposed development and suitable mitigation where necessary. These include:

- Movement of vehicles along the proposed haul road between Pitsford Quarry and Pitsford Pond and the effectiveness of soil bund along the proposed haul road
- De-watering of Pitsford Pond using water pump
- Impact of noise on Fox Covert Hall
1.7.2 Table 2.1 of the assessment demonstrates that the predicted noise contribution from HGV movements to and from Pitsford Quarry to Pitsford Pond will be considerably lower at the identified receptors than the existing background noise levels, NPPF noise limits and the existing planning conditions for Pitsford Quarry.

1.7.3 The assessment also concludes that the proposed bund along part of the length of the proposed haul road will provide a beneficial contribution towards reducing noise levels relative to the Bunkers Hill Farm Complex from activities along the Haul Road and also within the Pond area.

1.7.4 Section 2.9 of the report considers an appropriate mitigation strategy required in order to minimise noise levels at nearby receptors when operating the water pump necessary to de-water the pond. These include:

- Maximise distance between pump location and nearest receptors
- Where practicable place the pump below water level
- The design noise level for the pump should be aimed at reducing noise from the pump to a level not exceeding 65Db (A).
- If this pump exceeds the above design level then an acoustic enclosure or screen would be required.

1.7.5 It is considered unlikely that the de-watering of Pitsford Pond will cause significant adverse impacts on nearby receptors such as those within the Bunkers Hill Farm Complex and that any emitting noise from the operation of a water pump can be suitably controlled.

1.7.6 The impact of noise at Fox Covert is included within Tables 2.1 and 2.2 of the assessment. These tables demonstrate that the emitting noise from the proposed operations will be sufficiently below the existing planning conditions regulating the impact of noise from the Pitsford Quarry operations.

1.7.7 The additional noise assessment demonstrates that the proposed development can be undertaken in a manner which will not cause significant adverse impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

1.8 Dust Management and Mitigation

1.8.1 There will be a range of mitigation measures puts in place to ensure that the risk of adverse impact is minimised. They are:

- The measures for the management and control of dust at the quarry will comply with any conditions which may be specified by the Local Planning Authority. The Quarry Manager will refer to the planning conditions, to determine the response to potential or actual dust emissions, taking into account current and forecast weather conditions.

- Daily visual inspections of the site will be carried out by the Quarry Manager, at the start of operations and subsequently as necessary, particularly during dry windy weather, to ensure that all potential or actual dust sources are identified and treated promptly.

- As an over-riding requirement, if any operations are identified as causing or likely to cause visible dust emissions across the boundary of the application site, those operations will be
modified, reduced or suspended until effective remedial action can be taken or the conditions
given rises to the emissions have moderated.

• General matters and the management of the site can affect the likelihood of significant dust
emissions. These include:
  o Use of clean water for dust suppression, to avoid re-circulating fine material;
  o High standards of house-keeping to minimise track-out and windblown dust;
  o A preventative maintenance programme, including readily available spares, to ensure
    the efficient operation of dust suppression equipment; and
  o Effective staff training in respect of the causes and prevention of dust.

• Soil stripping, stockpiling and restoration is generally a short-term seasonal activity and,
given the low volumes to be handled, there is considerable flexibility as to its timing. Soils
handling will be suspended near the site boundaries when the wind conditions are likely to
result in visible dust being carried off-site, particularly across any footpaths. Soil stripping will
be programmed sufficiently in advance of extraction to avoid possible conflicts with other
operations. Areas of stripped ground and other loose bare surfaces will be watered or treated
with a proprietary stabiliser as necessary to minimise the potential for windblown dust.

• Freshly-constructed soil bunds will be watered and seeded at the earliest opportunity to bind
the surface and minimise the effects of windblown dust.

• Loading and tipping heights will be minimised. Wherever possible, loading and tipping
operations will take place in sheltered locations within the pond and quarry void, or in the lee
of existing mounds and stockpiles.

• Standard good practice for site haulage will include:
  o The avoidance of abrupt changes in horizontal and vertical alignment;
  o Regular grading and compaction to maintain smooth well-drained surfaces;
  o Setting a speed limit of 10 mph (16 kph);
  o Fitting site vehicles and plant with upswept exhausts and radiator fan shields; and
  o Evenly loading vehicles to avoid spillages.

• The haul route will be sprayed regularly in dry conditions using a water bowser.

• The stone cropping process will take place within a shed at all times to contain any
emissions. Should persistent visible emissions result, the process will be carried out under
water sprays.

• All departing lorries will be inspected, and will be cleaned as necessary, to ensure that track-
out is not carried towards the site entrance. All departing lorries will be required to pass
through a wheelwash.

• A speed limit of 10mph will be set on the access road and signage to this effect will be
erected at the site entrance.

• The surface of the access road will be damped down and will be maintained as necessary to
ensure effective dust control. In the event of track-out being carried onto the public highway,
a road sweeper will be deployed to remedy the matter.
• A water bowser, fitted with a spray bar or spinner and water gun, will be kept on site and will be deployed as necessary to treat any dry surfaces of the access road, haul road, stockpiles and other areas of loose bare ground. Provision will be made for the rapid filling of the bowser so that it can be used as necessary under all weather conditions.

• Should visible dust be blown from any storage mounds or restoration area, the relevant surfaces will be treated with water or a proprietary stabiliser. Final restoration surfaces will be seeded at the earliest opportunity.

• The mitigation of emissions of fine particulate matter will be achieved primarily by means of the above dust management and control measures.

1.8.2 The adoption of the mitigation measures set out above will mean that the risk of adverse effects due to dust can be managed to avoid adverse impacts at any receptor in the vicinity of the site.

1.9 Drainage of Pitsford Pond

1.9.1 Prior to restoring the pond, it will need to be dewatered. This will be achieved by pumping the water into Pitsford Quarry where it will soak into the ground through the in situ Northampton Sand Ironstone remaining at the side of the quarry.

1.9.2 A bunded area of the quarry of approximately 400m² will be constructed, contained by a 1m high bund, to allow the pond water to soak away. Based on a pumping rate of 10 l/s, the pond will take approximately 50 days to empty.

1.9.3 It is proposed that the water pump will be located at the south-western edge of the pond with the pump hose following the route of the haul road back towards the quarry where water will be discharged into a designated soakaway, as shown on drawing GPP/PB/PP/13/09 in Appendix 4.

1.9.4 Concerns have previously been raised regarding the removal of parasites from the water within the Pond during the dewatering process. Having recently sought advice from the Environment Agency, two parasites have been identified as being present within Pitsford Pond, known as Ergasilus sieboldi and Ergasilus briani, both of which are non-native crustacean parasites.

1.9.5 Advice from the Environment Agency suggests that both identified species have a complex but sensitive life cycle. The parasites rely on the correct environmental conditions to reproduce and survive therefore by pumping water in Pitsford Pond to Pitsford Quarry and removing the host fish, it will ensure that their lifecycle is broken resulting in negligible risks to the environment.
2 CONCLUSIONS

2.1.1 The additional information provided within this report demonstrates that a range of environmental issues such as dust, flood risk and drainage, ecology and highways have been comprehensively dealt with through the proposed scheme.

2.1.2 The additional information specifically addresses the comments raised by statutory consultees and addresses the main concerns raised by members of the public.

2.1.3 It has been demonstrated previously that the proposed development is broadly compliant with relevant planning policy at both local and national level; the development will not pose any significant adverse impacts; there is an identified need for the development and it will continue to sustain existing jobs.
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Dear Paul

Pitsford Quarry habitat assessment in relation to great crested newt with recommendations for enhancement to comply with Natural England and the Wildlife Trust consultation responses

Site status
The whole of the site including T’s Wood, the restored grassland areas and the working quarry, was designated a County Wildlife Site (CWS) in December 2010 having met the criteria for the open mosaic and acid grassland habitat. The grassland north of the quarry meets the criteria for acid grassland irrespective of the working quarry area. The WT in their survey of 2009 found 11 indicator species (presumably across the site) and the CCL survey in May found 8 in the grassland north of the quarry, including the strong indicator common cudweed (*Filago vulgaris*). The flora within the fenced trial plots in the grassland to the north of the quarry is currently no more or less diverse than in the grass area generally.

The presence of great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) in the RIGGS site ponds, north of the working quarry, would also qualify the site as a CWS. Great crested newt terrestrial habitat is considered to be the restored grassland to the north of the quarry, the roadside tree planting, and possibly T’s Wood. The RIGGS ponds are all eutrophic, one is steep sided and all are heavily shaded by the bankside vegetation dominated by goat (*Salix caprea*) and crack willow (*S. fragilis*) with occasional elder (*Sambucus nigra*), silver birch (*Betula pendula*) and dog-rose (*Rosa canina*) scrub. Bluebell (*Hyacinthoides non-scripta*) a BAP species is present. The heavy shading has had a negative impact on submerged and emergent vegetation and has probably contributed to silting up the ponds. The middle pond contains an old and rusting vehicle. There could well be other rubbish in the water not visible at present.

To date the management of the restored areas of the quarry site has been undertaken in compliance with an annual management schedule which does not benefit from the feedback produced by a
more formal and longer-term management plan. Therefore it is recommended that an Ecological Management Plan is produced and implemented prior to any work commencing on the Pitsford Pond site.

The management plan will need to address the comments received by Tina Cuss and Natural England regarding the great crested newt (gcn) at Pitsford and the consultation response from the Wildlife Trust for the restoration of Pitsford Pond.

We recommend that future management of the gcn habitat at the quarry, both aquatic and terrestrial, is modified to address:

- While the use of herbicides have successfully controlled problem weeds during establishment of the acid grassland north of the quarry, frequency of ragwort in the sward now lends itself to be managed by pulling before the plants set seed and this will be beneficial to the invertebrates that forage on this plant and avoid the risk of harming non-target species including terrestrial great crested newt.

- The grassland needs to be cut later in the year than present and the cut grass removed from site. A cut in late July or August with benefit the wildflower component of the grassland, as will removing the cuttings which otherwise form a mat that inhibits establishment of all but the most robust grasses. Diversity in the grassland will improve invertebrate diversity and benefit species higher in the food chain.

- The ponds are suffering from heavy shading due to the amount of scrub that has established close by. However, prior to removal liaison with the Northants RIGGS group will be necessary. Tree and scrub removal should be undertaken during the winter months with supervision from an ecologist to ensure that no hibernating great crested newt are disturbed. Non-willow trees should be used to create dead-wood refugia close to the ponds. Felled willow can be stacked away from the ponds in a shady area beside a hedgerow. As much as possible of the vehicle should be removed from the pond and all other rubbish removed. As vehicle removal will necessitate the use of an excavator it is also recommended that some of the emergent vegetation is removed from the centre of the eastern pond to create an area of open water, fringe vegetation should remain to provide alternative habitat for the reed bunting. This work should be undertaken between September and November.

- It is essential that the ponds are fenced to keep dogs and children out the area. Stock fencing should be used as it will not restrict rabbit movement and rabbits can be used to control regrowth of scrub. The fence should include a gated vehicle access that must be kept locked. Herbicide should not be used to treat the scrub stumps.

- Amphibian populations will need to be monitored and subsequent management of the site should reflect survey results. This could be undertaken in conjunction with Moulton College who are looking for a local project. A notice board explaining the management activities may help to prevent vandalism to the area.
• There is no need for sand martin (*Riparia riparia*) artificial nest sites if the cliff they are currently using will be retained. These birds will continue to use the site regardless of additional activity and will probably feed over the gcn ponds once the scrub is cleared.

Yours sincerely

Rebecca Barrett
Ecologist
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1.0  Introduction

1.1 Noise & Vibration Consultants Ltd (“NVC”) were originally instructed by GP Planning Ltd acting on behalf of Peter Bennie Ltd to prepare a noise impact assessment in respect of the restoration of a former minerals extraction site in association with inert recycling and stone extraction operations located at Pitsford Pond & Quarry, Moulton Road, Pitsford (Ref: R12.1105/DRK).

1.2 The noise assessment was provided to support a planning application to establish the impact arising from operational activities on local residents from noise and to ensure that they would not be significantly affected by the introduction of the development.

1.3 Subsequent to the planning submission, further information and clarification has been requested by the Local Authority. The points that require clarification include the following:

(a) Assess the noise from vehicle movements along the haul road between the Quarry and the Pond and offloading of material into the pond. We have been asked to consider the impacts of this activity at nearest sensitive receptors.

(b) Assess and comment on the effectiveness of introducing an earth bund along the haul road (as indicated on the attached Figure 1).

(c) In order to undertake the infilling of the pond, the site will need to dewater the pond over a period of 50 days (24hr per day). Assess and advise on the noise associated with the water pump required to operate for this period.

(d) Consider the impact of noise from site activities (including crushing operations) on Fox Covert Hall (which forms part of a complex of two properties, the other one being Fox Covert Farm).

(e) Whilst not required by the relevant noise guidance for this type of development, provide information on LAmax noise levels predicted at nearest receptors by the proposed site activities.

(f) Provide information on monitoring of noise levels once the site is operational to show compliance with any appropriate consented noise condition.

(g) Provide information on how complaints would be investigated and communicated with the LPA.
2.0 Additional Clarification & Information

a) Assess the noise from vehicle movements along the haul road between the Quarry and the Pond

2.1 The noise prediction model provided for the original noise assessment for the cumulative effect of all plant operating included the following plant operations and our assumptions:

(i) HGV movement along the access road to the site (we have allowed for 6 movements per hour over a daytime shift (i.e. 54 movements, which compares to an expected 44 HGV movements per day)

(ii) Dump truck operating between the quarry and pond (two movements required per day, we have allowed for additional static operations for a total of 2 hours at the quarry and 3 hours at the pond i.e. engine running whilst static). Dump truck working in the pond area assumed to be 6 movements per hour and operating all day.

(iii) Dozer working intermittently at the pond to move the infill (3 movements per hour over the daytime shift and static operation for a total of 1 hour over the shift).

(iv) Dump truck working at the quarry (6 movements per hour) and operating all day.

(v) Excavator operating at the quarry or at the pond for a cumulative total of 5 hours at each position over a daytime shift.

(vi) Power screen working at quarry all day.

2.2 For site operational noise we have used BS5228: 2009 prediction modelling and CadnaA software for producing noise maps of the highest likely generated noise.

2.3 The methodology takes into account source position, distance, duration of activity, and any screening from existing earth mound bunds in relation to the nearest sensitive receptors. The noise modelling assumes that all plant detailed above are operating at the same time. The prediction calculations therefore provide an indication of the highest likely noise level.

2.4 The list of plant sound power levels (SWL's) from which the noise predictions were made are presented in Appendix C of the original report. The plant complement is based on sound pressure levels from empirical data recorded by NVC at other similar sites in the UK.

2.5 The inclusion of HGV movement from the quarry to Pitsford Pond based on 6 movements per hour over the daytime shift period has been included in the cumulative effect at nearest receptors.

2.6 The results of noise predictions are provided below in Tables 2.1 to 2.2 and noise maps 1 and 2 in Appendix 1. This excludes any further proposed screening from the earth mound screen south of the pond.
2.7 The effect of placing an earth mound screen along the southern boundary of the pond to a height of 3 metres has been considered and its location is highlighted in Figure 1.

2.8 The predicted noise improvement relative to receptor 3 (Bunkers Hill Farm) is shown to be between approximately 2dB to 7dB LAeq. The actual reduction will however be dependent on the location of the noise source relative to the screen and the depth of fill and therefore it is not appropriate to condition its

---

(b) **Assess and comment on the effectiveness of introducing an earth bund along the haul road (as indicated on Figure 1 attached)**

---

Table 2.1: Predicted Noise Contribution from HGV Movement to and from the quarry to the pond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Position</th>
<th>Background noise level LA90 (dB) [lowest L90]</th>
<th>NPPF Noise Limit LAeq1hr dB</th>
<th>Existing quarry noise conditions LAeq1hr dB</th>
<th>Predicted noise level LAeq(dB)</th>
<th>Level difference dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fox Covert Farm</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>-26 to -18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Fox Covert Hall</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>-25 to -17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Oaks</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32-33</td>
<td>-23 to -15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butcher’s Lane</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>-25 to -19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stud Farm Cottages</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>-26 to -21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spring Meadow Farm</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>-27 to -21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stewart Close</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>-33 to -27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Holcot Centre</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>-34 to -29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Predicted Noise Contribution from Fixed & Mobile Plant on site (all operating) in Infill, Recycling and Quarrying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Position</th>
<th>Background noise level LA90 (dB) [lowest L90]</th>
<th>NPPF Noise Limit LAeq1hr dB</th>
<th>Existing quarry noise conditions LAeq1hr dB</th>
<th>Predicted noise level LAeq(dB)</th>
<th>Level difference dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fox Covert Farm</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42-43</td>
<td>-13 to -5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Fox Covert Hall</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43-44</td>
<td>-12 to -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Oaks</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>-8 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butcher’s Lane</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>-15 to -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Holding</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>-15 to -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stud Farm Cottages</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>-19 to -14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spring Meadow Farm</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>-17 to -11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stewart Close</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>-27 to -21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performance. It is concluded however that the screen will have a benefit in reducing noise levels relative to Bunkers Hill Farm albeit varying in improvement relative to activities at any one particular time. Refer to noise maps 1 to 6 attached for change in noise levels at Bunkers Hill Farm with and without the earth mound screen.

(c) In order to undertake the infilling of the pond, the site will need to dewater the pond over a period of 50 days (24hr per day). We need to assess and advise on the noise associated with the pump required to operate for this period.

2.9 The pump required to de-water the pond will need to be located and attenuated in order to prevent any noise disturbance relative to the nearest receptors. With the pump operating for a number of weeks and 24 hours a day it is important that appropriate noise control measures are introduced. The noise level from the pump may vary depending on the pump selection. We would recommend the following mitigation strategy in order to minimise noise levels at receptors:

(i) Wherever practicable maximise distance between pump location and nearest receptor/s.

(ii) Where practicable place the pump below water level.

(iii) The design noise level for the pump should be aimed at reducing noise from the pump to a level not exceeding 65dB(A) @ 1m (this would ensure that any noise contribution during night-time would not exceed 25dB(A) Leq at the closest potential approach).

(iv) If the pump exceeds the above design level then an acoustic enclosure or screen would be required to reduce noise levels.

(d) Consider the impact of noise from site activities (including crushing operations) on Fox Covert Hall (which forms part of a complex of two properties, the other one being Fox Covert Farm).

2.10 The impacts at Fox Covert Hall which forms part of two properties in the area of Fox Covert Farm is included in the noise predictions provided above in Table 2.1 and 2.2 and is identified in noise maps 1 to 9 attached.

2.11 The impact of crushing activities is only likely to occur for up to 30 days per year on an `as and when required' basis. The predicted noise levels during this activity were provided for the original noise assessment and are provided below based on a sound power level of between 109dB to 114dB, which is based on updated library data for a mobile crusher.

2.12 During this activity it is unlikely that screening operations would be undertaken at the same time. Noise map 7 is attached which provides the predicted noise contours. The proposed location for the mobile screen is indicated on Figure 2, which maximises the separation distance between sensitive receptors and utilises the screening from existing earth mound screens.
2.13 Further advice on applying best practicable means is provided in section 3.0 of this report in accordance with BS5528: 2009.

Table 2.3: Predicted Noise Contribution from Occasional Crushing Activities on Site (with earth mound screen south of the pond)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Position</th>
<th>Background noise level LA90 (dB) [lowest L90]</th>
<th>NPPF Noise Limit LAeq1 hr dB</th>
<th>Existing quarry noise conditions LAeq,1hr dB</th>
<th>Predicted noise level LAeq(dB)</th>
<th>Level difference dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fox Covert Farm</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>-9 to -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Fox Covert Hall</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>-8 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Oaks</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>-8 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bunkers Hill Farm</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45-46</td>
<td>-10 to -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butcher’s Lane</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>-9 to -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Holding</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>-15 to -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stud Farm Cottages</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>-17 to -14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spring Meadow Farm</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-16 to -11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Holcot Centre</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>-27 to -16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Predicted Noise Contribution from Cumulative Effects of Crushing, fixed & mobile plant on site (all operating) in Infill and Quarrying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Position</th>
<th>Background noise level LA90 (dB) [lowest L90]</th>
<th>NPPF Noise Limit LAeq1 hr dB</th>
<th>Existing quarry noise conditions LAeq,1hr dB</th>
<th>Predicted noise level LAeq(dB)</th>
<th>Level difference dB(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fox Covert Farm</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>-8 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Fox Covert Hall</td>
<td>44 [43]</td>
<td>53-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>-8 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Oaks</td>
<td>45 [41]</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>-7 to +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butcher’s Lane</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>-9 to -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Holding</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42-43</td>
<td>-13 to -7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spring Meadow Farm</td>
<td>45 [42]</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>-15 to -9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Home Farm (Pitsford)</td>
<td>47 [46]</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>-7 to -4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.14 The noise levels at positions 1 and 2 can be reduced slightly by placement of stockpiles placed west and north of the crusher location. See noise map 9.

(e) Whilst not required by the relevant noise guidance for this type of development, provide information on LAmax noise levels predicted at nearest receptors by the proposed site activities.
2.15 The change between LAeq and LAmax levels for this type of development would typically vary between +8dB and up to +20dB depending on the plant and activity being undertaken. The comparison between typical baseline levels and predicted LAmax levels at the receptors is provided below in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Predicted LAmax Noise Levels from Cumulative Effects of Crushing, fixed & mobile plant on site (all operating) in Infill, Recycling and Quarrying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Position</th>
<th>Typical Existing LAmax levels (dB)</th>
<th>Predicted noise level LAmax (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fox Covert Farm</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>55-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Fox Covert Hall</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>55-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Oaks</td>
<td>53-83</td>
<td>56-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bunkers Hill Farm</td>
<td>53-82</td>
<td>55-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butcher’s Lane</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>54-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Church Holding</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>50-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stud Farm</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>47-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stud Farm Cottages</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>47-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spring Meadow Farm</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>48-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Moulton Mill</td>
<td>51-78</td>
<td>48-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Home Farm (Pitsford)</td>
<td>53-83</td>
<td>56-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stewart Close</td>
<td>53-83</td>
<td>39-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Holcot Centre</td>
<td>53-83</td>
<td>36-49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.16 The range of LAmax levels is not deemed to be significant for daytime operations when considering the existing typical range of levels. There is no specific guidance for daytime LAmax levels and as such is difficult to condition due to the fact that a LAmax level is very sensitive to ambient noise local to receptor positions (e.g. birdsong, local and distant road traffic, aircraft, local garden activities etc) and it is therefore very difficult to pinpoint what is the source of the peak level.

(f) Provide information on monitoring of noise levels once the site is operational to show compliance with any appropriate consented noise condition and g) Provide information on how complaints would be investigated and communicated with the LPA.

2.17 We have provided a draft compliance noise monitoring scheme, which is detailed in Appendix 2 attached and includes information regarding a complaint procedure.

3.0 Noise Mitigation

3.1 The following provides an example of noise mitigation strategy that would achieve appropriate and reasonable noise criteria.
(i) The HGV's enter and exit the site from the existing entrance off Harborough Road.

(ii) All mobile plant used on site to have `broadband' type reverse alarms (i.e. no tonal `beeper type). Where practicable, HGV's within the control of the site operator to have similar reverse type alarms fitted or the use of a banksman to reduce the need for alarms. Where HGV's are subcontractor vehicles they should be encouraged to use this type of alarm or provide appropriate turning circles to avoid the need to reverse.

(iii) Proposed operating hours to be restricted to those described in the report.

(iv) Stock piles around the crusher plant would be best placed on the northern and western side of the plant to provide maximum screening to receptors in this direction. Orientation of crusher to have quietest elevation facing north.

(v) Orientation of the screen with the quietest elevation pointing northwards should be considered (i.e. output conveyor end facing north).

(vi) An additional earth mound screen placed south of Pitsford Pond to provide further attenuation in the direction of Bunkers Hill Farm receptor. The reduction for this feature is not included in the noise prediction calculations.

Site Management:

3.2 In order to follow best practice without placing unreasonable burden on the mineral operator, working methods and guidance and advice has been considered, which is provided within BS5228-1: 2009 and includes the following:

a) Drivers of HGVs or mobile plant should be instructed to avoid leaving engines running unnecessarily or excessive revving of engines;

b) Introduce speed limits on the site access road and avoid the use of speed `humps';

c) Retain and maintain the existing earth mounds located around the quarry area to their existing or constructed height;

d) Ensure the haul road between the recycling area and Pitsford Pond is well maintained, minimum gradient, as smooth as practicable and gradual turns;

e) Any small generators or pumps to be used at site to be placed as far as practicable from Noise Sensitive Premises (NSPs);

f) Location of site elements that generate noise to be located with due regard to proximity of NSPs including haul roads;
g) Selection of plant for use on site to have consideration of least impact in terms of noise (i.e. where practicable utilise modern plant);

h) The movement of plant on and off site restricted as far as is practicable within the agreed working hours for the site;

i) minimize drop heights of materials;

j) start-up plant and vehicles sequentially rather than all together;

k) modification of existing plant and equipment by the application of improved sound reduction methods;

l) use of enclosures for static plant, where practicable and necessary;

m) regular and effective maintenance of plant;

n) where practicable, construct the outer part of any proposed baffle mound so that the remaining work on the mound is shielded from NSPs.

3.3 The Local Authority is able to set out reasonable planning consent conditions to ensure that residential amenity is protected without creating un-necessary burden on the development.
FIGURES
Figure 1: Proposed Additional Earth Mound Screen South of the Pond
Figure 2: Proposed Location of Mobile Crusher and Screen on Site to Minimise Noise & Stockpile Location
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Appendix 2

Compliance Noise Monitoring Scheme

1. Following the installation of noise amelioration measures and with the site operational, noise monitoring will be carried out to show compliance with planning consent conditions.

2. Proposed noise monitoring will include the following:

   Noise measurements at far field locations will be carried out over at least two non-consecutive hours during the period 0700 and 1800 hours at the closest accessible position to the following property boundaries:

   i) Fox Covert Farm/Fox Covert Hall
   ii) The Oaks
   iii) Bunkers Hill Farm
   iv) Home Farm

3. Noise monitoring will be carried out with the plant operating under normal conditions for the duration of the site tests.

4. Noise monitoring of background noise (i.e. without the site operational) during the survey would also be undertaken to establish any non-site attributable noise sources, which may be a contributory factor. This may be possible just prior to commencement of site operations and/or when the site has shut-down during break times or in a representative location away from the influence of the site in accordance with BS4142: 1997.

5. Far Field noise levels will be measured in 15 minute sampling periods recorded over the operating period from which the average hourly noise levels would be established. Noise levels would be recorded in terms of LAeq, LA10, LA90 and LAmax.

6. The noise level meter/s will be calibrated prior to and after the measurements to ensure accuracy of results. The microphone will be fitted onto a tripod at a height of at least 1.2m above ground level and fitted with a windshield. Far field noise measurements will be taken at a distance of at least 3.5 metres from the nearest reflecting surface. All measurements would be undertaken to comply with the requirements of BS 4142:1997.

7. All noise monitoring equipment would be Type 1 graded instruments for optimum accuracy.
8. The results of the survey and findings would form an integral part of a comprehensive report assessing noise levels from the site.

9. The noise monitoring will be undertaken under suitable weather conditions i.e. light winds (i.e. below 3m/s) at monitoring positions and dry monitoring period.

10. If the survey identifies any noise problems in relation to the non-compliance with the planning conditions, further detailed investigations will be undertaken to establish the source and location of the problem and proposals forwarded for remedial action.

11. The noise-monitoring scheme would be carried out at 12 monthly intervals beginning in the first month in which the site is operational. Results of the noise monitoring would take the form of a report prepared by an appointed noise consultant with relevant qualifications and experience (i.e. at least 5 years practical experience in environmental acoustics and a Member of the Institute of Acoustics and/or Association of Noise Consultants), and would be sent to the Local Authority for approval. Any problems identified would be reported immediately together with proposals for amelioration measures.

12. In the event of a noise complaint, the following investigations would be undertaken:

(i) Establish the nature of the complaint (i.e. when it occurred, what was heard and the duration of the event) from the complainant.

(ii) If the event can be proved to be attributed to an isolated event that would not occur again, provide information in writing to the Local Planning Authority to explain the reasons for the event and action taken to prevent its re-occurrence.

(iii) If the event is likely to re-occur carry out noise monitoring at the complainant's property boundary in accordance with the procedure described above with the identified noise source in operation or if not known, tests carried out with similar activities being undertaken at site, as experienced at the time of the complaint.
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