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1. Updating the Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Why do we need to update the Minerals and Waste Local Plan?

1.1. Northamptonshire County Council is the minerals and waste planning authority for the whole of Northamptonshire. This means that it is responsible for all matters associated with minerals and waste development, including setting the land use policies and determining planning applications for such development.

1.2. Decisions on planning applications should be made on the basis of having an up-to-date statutory development plan. This is a plan that sets out strategy, provision, policies and sites for minerals and waste development. Northamptonshire has such a plan; the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP).

1.3. The MWLP was adopted on 1 October 2014. The MWLP brought together and updated the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) which was portfolio of individual documents known as Local Development Documents (LDDs) adopted in 2010 and 2011. These comprised a Core Strategy, site-specific documents for minerals and waste and a document comprising policies on which to determine planning applications. The key diagram for the adopted MWLP is contained in Appendix 1, it illustrates the spatial strategies for minerals extraction and waste management. The MWLP rolled the statutory components of the MWDF into one combined document and extended the plan period from 2026 to 2031.

1.4. The MWDF also comprised a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), called Development and Implementation Principles, which provides practical guidance on implementing development. This document will be updated (separately) to reflect the adoption of the MWLP.

1.5. There are additional documents that are produced to support the Local Plan, including the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), the Minerals and Waste Monitoring Report (MWMR) and, this document, the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS). The production of all of these documents is a statutory requirement.

1.6. Government guidance says that planning authorities should have and maintain an up-to-date plan. Although the MWLP is currently up-to-date and fully compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it needs to remain so. Bearing in mind revisions normally take around two to three years depending on complexity, the gap between revisions should be relatively short.

1.7. It is proposed that the update will concentrate on the minerals and waste allocations and designations and the approach taken to these, particularly regarding waste sites. In addition recent local circumstance have brought forward a need to provide more comprehensive coverage of fire safety for waste development. The update offers a timely opportunity to cover this specific matter. It is not proposed to review any other components of the adopted MWLP.

1.8. The update does not change the status of the adopted MWLP as the statutory development plan for Northamptonshire.

Call for Sites

1.9. A ‘Call for Sites’ was undertaken in late 2014 in order to identify industry interests, future investment options/appetite and gauge the level of support for existing allocations. This process also provides the Council with evidence in respect of whether wider policy stances in the Local Plan should be amended as part of the Local Plan Update. A letter was sent out to stakeholders (including the minerals and waste industry representatives and operators, landowners and agents) notifying them of the upcoming Local Plan Update, that existing allocations would be subject to review and requesting information on any sites that they have an interest in bringing forward for consideration (for minerals or waste development). All sites put forward will be subject to assessment as per the Site Assessment Methodology (February 2015). It is important to note that the Call for Sites exercise does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for development.
Sustainability and environmental assessment

1.10. The MWLP update is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report and site assessments. Depending on the location of new sites put forward a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) may be required. It should be noted that only those areas under review require further assessment.

How to get involved

1.11. This consultation paper focusses mainly on locations for minerals and waste development with discussion on sites brought forward and current allocations and the approach taken to these. We would like to hear from you with respect to these matters. This consultation paper, SA Scoping Report, site assessments and Consultation Response Form are available on the County Councils website or by contacting us by post, telephone or email.

1.12. The consultation period for this paper commenced on 14 May 2015 for eight weeks. The closing date for feedback is 09 July 2015 and all responses must be received before 5:00pm on this date.

1.13. Further consultation will take place as the MWLP update progresses. The next stage will be a Draft Plan for consultation this will be in late 2015 and will include an SA Environmental Report and, if required, an HRA Appropriate Assessment. Representations made in response to the Draft Plan and SA Environmental Report will be given due consideration in the preparation of the Final Plan in mid 2016. Following the examination of the Plan, to be undertaken by an independent inspector in late 2016, it is anticipated that the Local Plan will be adopted in early 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for sites</td>
<td>November – December 2014</td>
<td>Landowners, agents and the minerals industry were asked if they have any sites they would wish to be considered as potential sites for minerals or waste use. Those with an interest in existing allocations were also asked about their intentions for these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Issues and Options</td>
<td>April – June 2015</td>
<td>This will contain our proposals on what we intend to review and ask for views on the options open to us (including where relevant sites put forward through the call for sites) and what the most appropriate approach is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Draft Plan</td>
<td>October – December 2015</td>
<td>This will set out the proposals, including site-specific allocations, to be taken forward and ask for comments on this. Only the changes to the adopted plan arising from the MWLP Update would be specifically consulted on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Final Plan</td>
<td>April – June 2016</td>
<td>Representations will be sought on the final plan intended to be submitted for examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Submission of the Plan for independent examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Public hearing sessions relating to the independent examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors Report</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>Publication of the Inspector’s Report. The MWLP Update can then progress to adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: MWLP Update stages and timetable
2. Locations for minerals development

Ensuring an adequate supply

2.1. The NPPF requires Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates to meet anticipated needs of the construction industry and growth by preparing a Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA). The LAA is required to: forecast the demand for aggregates based on average ten-year sales data and other relevant local information; analyse all aggregate supply options and; assess the balance between demand and supply.

2.2. The annual provision figure for sand and gravel calculated on the basis of average aggregate sales over a ten-year rolling period (2001 – 2010) is 0.50 Million tonnes (Mt). The annual provision figure for crushed rock was increased (from the ten-year average of 0.33 Mt) to 0.39 Mt to reflect the steady increase in sales in recent years and the increase in sites that have been coming forward for permission and being implemented, unlike for sand and gravel. Building and roofing stone and recycled and secondary aggregate are also used within the county however a specific provision rate for these materials are not identified. In order to facilitate delivery of the above provision rates and aggregates site allocations should be identified in the plan.

2.3. The 2014 LAA includes the most recent (2013) aggregate sales and reserves data and covers the period 2004 to 2013. The average aggregate sales for sand and gravel for the most recent ten and three year rolling periods is 0.38 Mt. The average aggregate sales for limestone for the most recent ten and three year rolling periods are 0.26 Mt and 0.19 Mt respectively. This data indicates that the ten-year average aggregate sales figures continues to trend downwards.

2.4. Due to the way in which data for minerals is collected the most up-to-date data is for 2013. As of 31 December 2013 Northamptonshire had seven sand and gravel quarries (one of which is for soft sand) and 13 limestone quarries; total remaining reserves are estimated to be around 3.89 Mt and 15.6 Mt (respectively). It should be noted that a number of the limestone sites are ironstone permissions with modern planning conditions. Details of permitted sites are set out in Table 1. Based on the adopted provision rates there are currently sufficient permitted reserves to maintain the government recommended landbanks. In addition, there are also 15 sites with planning permission to produce recycled aggregates (as of 31 December 2013).

Table 1: Permitted mineral sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sand and Gravel</th>
<th>Crushed Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Castle Manor Farm,</strong> Thrapston</td>
<td><strong>Collyweston, (Duddington)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction has finished at this site and it is now being restored. Restoration planned to be complete by September 2015.</td>
<td>Operational with the quarrying of limestone and Collyweston Slate. Permission granted in 2014, subject to s106 agreement to continue extraction here for a further ten years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Farm,</strong> Bozeat</td>
<td><strong>Cowthick</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational with material processed at Earls Barton Quarry plant site. Extraction due to finish in 2016.</td>
<td>Modern planning conditions for ironstone extraction. Inactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earls Barton Marina</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harlestone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission granted for extraction to create a marina basin.</td>
<td>Operational with permission to extract until end 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earls Barton Spinney</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harley Way</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission granted for new quarry to extract 1.1 Mt of sand and gravel. Extraction to take up to 8 years when it commences.</td>
<td>Operational. Permission granted in 2012 for extraction of 0.18 Mt of limestone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earls Barton West</strong></td>
<td><strong>Park Lodge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction of 2.4 Mt of sand and gravel. Some extraction took place to implement permission but not currently operational. Permission runs to 2023.</td>
<td>Modern planning conditions for ironstone extraction. Inactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elton Estate,</strong> Warmington</td>
<td><strong>Pitsford</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational with extraction to enable the construction of an agricultural reservoir. Will finish by end 2018.</td>
<td>Modern planning conditions for ironstone extraction. Inactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lilford Lodge Farm,</strong> Lilford</td>
<td><strong>Priors Hall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational with permission for the extraction of 0.4 Mt to create a marina basin. Extraction almost finished at this location.</td>
<td>Borrow pit for use in the development of Priors Hall urban extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenheim</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modern planning conditions for ironstone extraction. Inactive.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational processing plant and ancillary facilities. Currently processes material extracted adjacent to the site in Milton Keynes. Application due imminently to continue operations into the area allocated in the MWLP.</td>
<td><strong>Inactive.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pury End  Operational. Permission to extract until end 2018.

Ringstead  Operational. Extraction of 1.95Mt of limestone. 15 years to work and restore (ends 2030).

Rushton  Limestone currently being extracted from Rushton Landfill site as part of its extension as a landfill site.

Stonehill Quarry  Permission granted in 2013 for the extraction of 0.008 Mt of limestone. 2 years to work from date of commencement

Stone Pits, Upper Benefield  Permission granted, subject to s106 agreement, in 2014 for building stone extraction.

Wakerley  Permission granted, subject to s106 agreement, in 2011 for crushed rock extraction. 10-year period for commencement on site from permission being issued. Working life of 45 years.

Weekley Hall Wood  Modern planning conditions for ironstone extraction. Inactive.

2.5. The plan period for the adopted MWLP is 2011 to 2031 (1 January 2011 to 1 January 2031), this Update does not seek to amend the plan period. As the most recent data on remaining reserves is for 31 December 2013 the Local Plan Update will seek to allocate sufficient sites to facilitate delivery of the adopted provision rates from 01 January 2014 to 01 January 2031 (i.e. a period of 17 years). Based on this the requirement is 8.5 Mt for sand and gravel and 6.63 Mt for limestone. These figures do not include reserve figures for three inactive old ironstone sites (Weekly Hall Wood, Cowthick and Park Lodge) as the quantity of economically viable mineral resources (if any) within these sites is unknown. Taking the estimated remaining reserves into account, the Local Plan Update should seek to secure (through the allocation of sites) 4.61 Mt for sand and gravel. There is currently a surplus of 8.97 Mt for limestone, however the majority of this is tied up in one site and so it may be prudent to identify at least one other site.

2.6. The amount of aggregate required over the plan period effectively drives the allocation of sites (as we need to facilitate delivery of aggregates and identifying sites helps do to so). The above requirements have been identified based on the Council seeking to deliver the provision rate for the remaining plan period with no allowance made thereafter. This may mean that towards the end of the plan period the landbanks fall below the recommended levels (seven years for sand and gravel and ten years for limestone). However, the plan will be updated on a regular basis (as per NPPF requirements to maintain an up-to-date plan) and so it is likely that such issues would be addressed as the plan period rolled forward and elements of the plan, including allocations, are updated. The allocation of sites presents the opportunity identify surplus or ‘reserve’ sites to allow for sufficient landbanks at the end of the plan period. This would mean identifying additional sites to secure 3.5 Mt for sand and gravel and 2.73 Mt for limestone.

2.7. Sites that produce recycled aggregates within the county use inert construction, demolition and excavation (CD&E) waste. Waste arisings and allocation of sites is covered under waste planning matters.

Issue 1: Planning for landbanks
Should the Council seek to encourage the maintenance of a landbank for sand and gravel (seven years) and limestone (ten years) after the end date of the plan by identifying surplus or reserve sites? Yes / No.

Allocations in the adopted MWLP

2.8. Site-specific allocations assist in delivering the plan by identifying a range of sites that are intended to be worked throughout the plan period and produce a yield that is sufficient to meet, or significantly contribute towards, the required aggregate provision. Allocations provide assurity and clarity to both industry and the community in relation to locations for development and delivery of the plan in general. Although a site being allocated does not equate to planning permission, the plan does give preference to allocated sites over unallocated ones. The adopted MWLP allocates twelve sites for extraction: seven for sand and gravel, three for limestone and two for building and roofing stone (one of which, Pury end (south), is allocated for both limestone and building stone).

2.9. Current status of allocated sites is summarised below:
Sand and gravel - To date none of the sand and gravel sites have come forward.

Limestone – Both Ringstead and Wakerley have been granted permission, but with the latter still requiring the signing of a legal agreement before the permission can be finalised. The remaining allocations, Pury End South (for the provision of crushed rock and building stone) and Collyweston Village (for roofing stone only), have not yet come forward.

2.10. As part of the Call for Sites and site assessment process, progress on all of the allocated sites was reviewed. A summary of this is set out in Table 2.
## Table 2: Progress on allocated sites (adopted MWLP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Status and progress update</th>
<th>Implications for the Local Plan Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand and gravel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA1 - Dodford</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Map" /></td>
<td>Planning status: Allocation Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): No Progress to date: Whilst this site was previously supported at the MWLP examination stage by the developer, this has since waned with no support expressed during the most recent Call for Sites round. This may be due to the developer seeing extraction here as linked to the development of the sustainable urban extensions (SUE) at Daventry. This SUE has not been included in the recently adopted West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The site is a glacial site that requires significant access works if it is not to be developed as part of the SUE.</td>
<td>Taking account of the reduced support and deliverability, as well as the reduced provision, it may not be appropriate for this site to remain as an allocation (particularly when taken on balance with other sites).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA2 - Milton Malsor</strong></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Map" /></td>
<td>Planning status: Allocation Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): Yes Progress to date: The agent/operator is continuing detailed negotiations with Network Rail over any bridge works needed to use the existing bridge over the railway as a haul route and this is progressing.</td>
<td>There is clear intent to deliver this site. As the only soft sand site in the adopted plan it appears to be a good site to remain as an allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MA3 - Bozeat Extension**

Planning status: Allocation
Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): No

Progress to date: Whilst this site was previously supported by the landowner at the MWLP examination stage, no support was expressed during the most recent Call for Sites round. The allocation was envisaged as an extension to the existing site, however, the operator (Hanson) indicated their intention is to finish working the existing site (glacial resource) and then move on to the allocation at Earls Barton West (river valley resource) that now has planning permission.

Taking account of the reduced support and the reduced provision, it may not be appropriate for this site to remain as an allocation (particularly when taken on balance with other sites).

**MA4 - Heyford**

Planning status: Allocation
Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): Yes

Progress to date: The implementation of this allocation is linked to the construction of the Flore-Weedon bypass, which would help provide a more straightforward access into the site. The bypass scheme is progressing; planning permission for it is currently being sought. It is provisionally planned for construction works to commence during 2015/6 with a two-year completion date. There is also now a prospective operator interested in taking this site forward.

This is a good river valley site with a prospective operator identified. Access issues can be fully addressed by the bypass. As such it appears to be a good site to remain as an allocation.
### MA5 - Earls Barton West Extension

**Planning status:** Allocation  
**Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry):** Yes.  
**Progress to date:** An environmental statement is being prepared in advance of submitting a planning application for that part of the allocation west of the main body of committed sites. The smaller eastern part of the site has also been supported but this is not linked to the larger western section. Part of the much smaller eastern part of the allocation was the subject of a planning application for mineral extraction to form a marina and was granted planning permission in 2014 (for 20,000 tonnes). Work on site has not yet commenced.

This is a good river valley site and appears to be a good site to remain as an allocation. However the smaller eastern part will not deliver a significant yield even if it can be implemented (the scale of these sites significantly impacts on the sites deliverability where not worked as a satellite of larger operations). Therefore there may be no real need to continue to include the eastern part as a standalone allocation (note that it could still come forward under the general mineral extraction policy (Policy 3).

### MA6 - Wollaston West

**Planning status:** Allocation  
**Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry):** No  
**Progress to date:** This site was not specifically supported at the MWLP examination stage, and no support was expressed during the most recent Call for Sites round. This is a river valley site that could utilise the processing site at Earls Barton via the existing conveyor (if it remains). If it does not remain then the site may be more difficult to implement.

This is a good river valley site however the scale of operations may impact on deliverability, especially if the conveyor cannot be utilised. This could be an appropriate site to identify as a reserve allocation.
MA7 - Passenham South

Planning status: Allocation
Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): Yes
Progress to date: Most of this allocation is the subject of a planning application for extraction submitted in March 2015. The area subject to planning application is only part of that identified through the allocation. Site investigations indicated that the remaining part of the site does not contain viable resources. Extraction is proposed to take place after the operator (GRS Roadstone) has completed extraction from the other side of the river in Milton Keynes Borough. The Milton Keynes site was mothballed for a while but the selling on of the operations/landholdings in the area from Cemex to GRS Roadstone means that production here has resumed. GRS Roadstone have submitted an application to the County Council for inert recycling at the processing plant on the Northamptonshire side, an application for a concrete batching plant is also planned to be submitted.

There is clear intent to deliver this site as demonstrated through the submission of the planning application. As such it appears to be a good site to remain as an allocation with an amended boundary (if permitted before the Local Plan Update it may be removed as an allocation). However that part of the allocation that is not subject to the planning application and that the applicant considers not to contain viable resources may not be appropriate to remain as an allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Planning Status</th>
<th>Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry)</th>
<th>Progress to date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA8 – Wakerley (crushed rock)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted subject to a section 106 agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This allocation was granted planning permission in July 2011 subject to a section 106 agreement. Signing is due shortly (as issues have been resolved), after which the permission can be issued. Due to the substantial and costly infrastructure works required to implement this site, the permission will have a ten-year period in which it can be implemented.</td>
<td>This is a site subject to a planning application that has been granted (subject to a legal agreement). It is taking a very long time to conclude the legal agreement and this lack of urgency indicates that there is no operator lined up for the site. The scale of the infrastructure works needed to implement the site are very major yet the limestone resources are not particularly valuable. It is expected that permission will be granted in 2015 and therefore should remain as an allocation. If permitted before adoption of the Local Plan Update it may be removed as an allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA9 – Ringstead (crushed rock)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Planning permission was granted in 2012 and extraction has commenced.</td>
<td>This site has planning permission and is operational and so will be removed as an allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MA10 - Pury End South (crushed rock and building stone)

Planning status: Allocation
Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): No
Progress to date: Whilst this site was previously supported at the MWLP examination stage, no support was expressed during the most recent Call for Sites round. It should be noted that this site was not to be implemented until extraction finishes at the nearby operational Pury End site. The operator of the existing site has since shifted focus and put forward (through the Call for Sites) a different site to the east of the operational site to continue operations, which benefits from proven resources.

Taking account of the reduced support and potential deliverability, it may not be appropriate for this site to remain as an allocation. It should be noted that there is also no specific provision for building stone to met by way of the identification of specific allocations.

MA11 - Collyweston Village (roofing stone)

Planning status: Allocation
Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry): No
Progress to date: Whilst this site was previously supported at the MWLP examination stage, no support was expressed during the most recent Call for Sites round. It should also be noted that there is interest in the wider area in respect of opening another former mine nearby (but in different ownership). In addition planning permission for extraction, which would include roofing stone extraction, was recently (2015) granted at the Collyweston Quarry at Duddington (subject to the signing of a legal agreement).

Taking account of the reduced support and potential deliverability, as well as a possible reduced need because of the extension at Collyweston Quarry, it may not be appropriate for this site to remain as an allocation. It should be noted that there is also no specific provision for building stone to be met by way of the identification of specific allocations.
### MA12 - Earls Barton Quarry Plant Site

- **Planning status:** Allocation
- **Supported at Call for Sites stage (landowner/industry):** No
- **Progress to date:** The site is used as a processing plant and therefore is suitable for other related uses, such as the recycling of aggregates, even if not specifically allocated for this purpose.

There is no requirement to continue to allocate this site as it is already in mineral-related use.
Sites brought forward through the Call for Sites process

2.11. As previously noted a Call for Sites was undertaken in late 2014 in order to bring forward expressions of interest and to gauge support for existing allocations. All sites put forward for minerals development, including sites that are currently allocations, have been subject to an initial screening assessment as per the Site Assessment Methodology. A summary of the initial screening assessment is detailed in Appendix 2. The full site assessments are available in the Technical Annex accompanying this consultation document. New sites included in this consultation document have no status and no decisions have been made about which, if any, of the new sites could be taken forward.

2.12. Allocations that were not specifically supported during the Call for Sites have been reviewed (refer Table 2) but have not been subject to the initial screening assessment and are not included below. This does not necessarily mean that they are to be excluded from the Plan, however the inclusion of such sites has been identified as an issue to be consulted on and given due consideration in the plan-making process (refer Issue 2).

2.13. Sites brought forward through the Call for Sites process, including those supporting existing allocations, are identified in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Sites brought forward through the Call for Sites process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New potential sites brought forward</th>
<th>Support received (through the Call for Sites) for existing allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand and gravel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denford Meadows</td>
<td>Earls Barton West Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eton Extension</td>
<td>Land West of Station Road, Earls Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenham Eastern Extension</td>
<td>Heyford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryehill Farm</td>
<td>Milton Malsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenham South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton Lodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlestone Quarry Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pury End Quarry Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issue 3: Potential allocations for the Local Plan Update

The Call for Sites process identified nine sites for sand and gravel, four for limestone (crushed rock) of which three also support production of building and roofing stone. All of these sites, plus the adopted allocations, have been subject to an initial screening assessment (refer Table 3).

3A) Do you agree with the brief summaries above, but in particular the findings of the assessments? Yes / No. If no, please provide details on why not.

3B) Are there any particular sites that you consider to be more/less suitable than others? Please provide your reasoning.

3C) If reserve sites were to be included in the Draft Plan do you consider any of the potential allocations more appropriate? Please provide your reasoning.

3D) As there is no specific provision to be met for building or roofing stone compared to sand and gravel and crushed rock is there any need to identify specific allocations for such extraction? Yes / No.

3E) Are there any other matters that you wish to raise about the approach to allocating mineral sites and to the potential allocations put forward for consideration?
3. Locations for waste development

Developing a sustainable waste management network

3.1. The NPPF does not specifically address waste matters, detailed waste planning policies are set out in the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW). The NPPW is to be read in conjunction with the NPPF, the National Waste Management Plan for England and National Policy Statements (NPS) for waste water and hazardous waste. In relation to the preparation of plans the NPPW requires Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) to “identify sufficient opportunities to meet the identified needs of their area for the management of waste streams” (paragraph 3). The plan should seek to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy whilst also making adequate provision for waste disposal. The extent to which the capacity of existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need should also be taken into consideration. This has been taken into account through the Local Assessment of Waste Management Needs (November 2013), with permitted capacity figures updates on an annual basis through the Minerals and Waste Monitoring Report (MWMR).

3.2. Paragraph 4 of the NPPW states that WPAs, in preparing Local Plans, should identify sites and/or areas for waste management facilities and in doing so: identify the broad type(s) of facility that would be appropriate; take account of the proximity principle (particularly regarding disposal and the recovery of MSW) and recognise the role of catchment areas in securing economic viability; consider opportunities for on-site waste management; consider a broad range of locations including industrial sites, and consider opportunities to to co-locate waste management facilities together and with complementary activities; and give priority to the re-use of previously-developed land, sites identified for employment uses, and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages.

3.3. The adopted MWLP seeks to provide sufficient waste management capacity to achieve net self-sufficiency. This capacity could either be delivered through extensions to existing sites or new sites.

3.4. MWLP Policies 11 and 18 set out the indicative capacity requirements for waste management and disposal to be met over the plan period (refer table below). The indicative capacity requirements were recently subject to review through the MWLP plan-making process and were found to be sound through the examination. Updated data (apart from permitted capacity) is not yet available and so there is no need to update the waste arisings forecasts and indicative capacity requirements.

Table 4: Indicative capacity requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy level</th>
<th>Management method</th>
<th>Indicative capacity requirement (million tonnes per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for re-use and recycling</td>
<td>Recycling (non-inert)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological processing</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inert recycling</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous recycling</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other recovery</td>
<td>Advanced treatment</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous treatment</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inert fill or recovery</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>Non-inert landfill</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inert fill or recovery</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous landfill</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Permitted capacity is updated on an annual basis through the MWMR, the most recent data is up to 31 December 2014; reported through the MWMR 2014. It is not feasible to update the plan on an annual basis to reflect updated permitted capacity and resulting capacity gaps – this is the role of the MWMR. Permitted capacity is used instead of operational capacity as it is not possible to obtain accurate operational capacity on an annual basis from all of the waste sites / operators within the County. Permitted capacity varies from operational capacity and so the actual operational capacity is likely to be less than the permitted capacity (which should be
viewed as a maximum). The degree of variance differs from site to site and operational capacity also fluctuates throughout the year hence it is difficult to determine the 'true' capacity.

3.6. Data reported through the MWMR indicated that there is sufficient permitted capacity for: recycling (non-inert), biological processing and hazardous treatment. To meet indicative requirements up to the end of the plan period additional capacity will be required for inert recycling (0.31 Mt), advanced treatment (0.40 Mt), inert recovery / landfill (0.14 Mt), non-inert landfill (0.85 Mt) and hazardous landfill (0.02 Mt). Therefore, in line with the plans vision and objectives we only need to look to fill the existing gaps. This does not mean that facilities for those management methods where sufficient capacity exists will not be permitted, applications for such development would still be able to come forward through the relevant policy but there is no need to identify specific sites within the plan to facilitate delivery of the capacity requirements (as these have been met).

Inert recycling

3.7. A significant proportion of inert recycling capacity is delivered through temporary facilities associated with development and inert recycling/processing associated with minerals development (including those allocated through the plan). The plan sets a preference for inert recycling facilities to be accommodated at the above locations as well as industrial areas and extensions to existing operations. The plan does not specifically allocate sites for inert recycling facilities. Inert recycling facilities are largely compatible with general industrial development locations, this may be the most appropriate avenue to facilitate the delivery of such development.

Advanced treatment

3.8. Within Northamptonshire there has been very limited take-up of allocated sites, however applications have come forward (and been approved) for advanced treatment facilities on allocated industrial areas and unallocated sites. There is currently a capacity gap of -0.40 Mt as a rough indication this may require three additional facilities. Advanced treatment facilities are largely compatible with general industrial development locations, this may be the most appropriate avenue to facilitate the delivery of such development.

3.9. The investment required for advanced treatment facilities and issues over their financing where banks often require long term, preferably municipal, contracts to lend does appear to have impacted on the implementation of permissions granted within the county. In addressing the current capacity gap there may be a need for more than the indicative three additional facilities referred to above if the current permissions are not all implemented.

Inert recovery / landfill

3.10. The plan sets a clear preference for inert recovery / landfill to be linked to the restoration of mineral extraction sites. The capacity gap for inert recovery / landfill is -0.14 Mt. Given the number (and yield) of allocations for mineral extraction this capacity will easily be taken up in future restoration works and so there appears to be no need to allocate sites for inert recovery / landfill.

Non-inert landfill

3.11. There are several issues affecting planning for the provision of non-inert landfill. These include data accuracy, emerging technologies and industry operating practices / investment decisions, outlined below.

Data accuracy and the impact of emerging technologies

3.12. The capacity gap for non-inert landfill is -0.85 Mt. Projections for non-inert waste requiring disposal include residual waste arising (as an output) from other waste management processes; this accounts for a significant amount (up to 0.18 Mt). Projections for residual waste arisings cannot be made with certainty due to the variables involved, however it is necessary to give consideration to potential arisings. It is in the waste industries interest to maximise operational efficiency and minimise such outputs, in addition as technologies improve so will efficiencies (reducing output rates). The capacity gap of 0.85 Mt includes residuals of 0.18 Mt. Efficient operations or improvements in processing could significantly reduce this, there is also a push to find ways to reuse outputs in order to maximise recovery (minimising the need to
dispose of residual materials). Waste projections are based on the best available data and most recent surveys however it is possible that current waste arisings are less than that indicated through reports, surveys and operator returns. For instance the CD&E survey undertaken by WRAP indicated arisings of 1.35 Mt for 2010, however the EA Waste Interrogator dataset reported only 0.60 Mt (a difference of 0.76 Mt) for 2010 this could be due to the EA dataset not picking up on waste being reused on site and at exempt sites, however it could also indicate that waste arisings are significantly less that that reported through the WRAP survey. This is speculative and so cannot be taken into consideration through the waste arising projections but would make a significant difference to the waste arisings and capacity over the plan period.

Industry operating practices / investment decisions

3.13. An issue that is particularly relevant to Northamptonshire is the decision by some (larger) waste operators to mothball non-inert landfill sites. These are permitted sites that have been shut down temporarily and are likely to be re-opened and continue operations in the future. The decision to mothball sites is driven by market forces; the Council effectively has no influence over the matter. In most cases there is insufficient waste input to the site to justify keeping it open and so the operator rationalises their assets by temporarily shutting down facilities until they are required again. The fact that some waste operators mothball non-inert landfills may also indicate that less waste is actually being produced than thought.

3.14. The above factors make it quite difficult to determine the future need for non-inert disposal capacity. Although the figures show a deficit in capacity, in practice the industry are not utilising permitted capacity. This calls into question whether additional capacity is actually required as there does not seem to be an appetite for sites (either coming forward through the planning application process or as potential allocations). It may be prudent to maintain the current approach of not allocating sites for non-inert landfill but keeping a watching brief and closely monitoring the situation.

Hazardous landfill

3.15. The capacity gap for hazardous landfill is -0.02 Mt, this is due to the current permission for the East Northamptonshire Resource Management Facility (ENRMF) expiring in 2026. The provision of a facility post 2026 to cater specifically for such net Northamptonshire capacity is highly unlikely to be viable. Furthermore planning policy for larger hazardous waste facilities is covered by the NPS on hazardous waste with applications determined by the National Infrastructure Directorate (not the Council as the WPA). However it is important that we continue to have policies addressing such matters for applications that fall below the threshold of the NPS on hazardous waste so that local matters can be given due consideration. Given the national context in which such facilities operate and the scale of economies the inclusion of local development criteria (Policy 19) in the plan appears to be sufficient (i.e. there appears to be no need to specifically allocate sites for hazardous landfill).

Radioactive waste

3.16. The adopted MWLP includes development criteria adressing radioactive waste management and disposal. The ENRMF is permitted for disposal of solid low level radioactive waste (LLW) and serves a national catchment. Northamptonshire does not produce LLW from the nuclear industry, and produces only very small amounts from the non-nuclear industry (34 m3 recorded in 2008). The permitted disposal capacity far outweighs Northamptonshire’s arisings and so the county is self-sufficient in relation to this area.

Allocations in the adopted MWLP

3.17. The MWLP allocates a total of 13 sites and also designates 21 industrial locations where waste management uses are considered acceptable in principle. Of the site-specific allocations three are for sites for integrated waste management facilities, seven are for sites for waste management use in or adjacent to urban areas, and three are for sites for waste management use in rural areas. Seven of the allocated sites have been brought forward and permitted for a waste management use (three permissions were granted prior to adoption of the MWDF Core Strategy, one permission was granted for existing uses to be made permanent, and three permissions granted remain unimplemented). Of the industrial locations within which waste management uses would be acceptable in principle seven have been brought forward and
permitted for a waste management use. In total 36 permissions for waste related development have been granted since adoption of the allocations (under the MWDF in 2010); of which 14% were on allocated sites, 39% were on allocated industrial locations and 47% were on unallocated sites.

3.18. The lack of uptake in the allocated sites probably relates to the fluidity of the waste industry and investment. Unlike minerals, which can only be worked where they are found, the waste industry is not tied to a particular site and so there is a much wider scope for investment. In addition the siting of facilities can change due to fluctuations in the broader economic landscape, in particular larger companies may shift interest from sites based on the organisation’s overall spread of facilities and contracts. Progress and uptake of emerging waste management processes may also impact on uptake of site-specific allocations. The allocated sites may not present the best option given a range of other (unallocated) sites that may also be available.

3.19. A summary of the status and progress on site-specific allocations is provided below:

- WS1 – Northampton, East: Has not been granted permission for waste use however general support (landowner) for the site remains.
- WS2 – Corby, South East: Permitted for waste use - part of the site is in use as a HWRC however limited progress has been made in relation to the development of an integrated facility for which it was allocated with no application yet submitted. General support (landowner) for the site remains.
- WS3 – Corby, Central East: Has not been granted permission for waste use however general support (landowner) for the site remains.
- WS5 – Northampton, Grange Park: No support was put forward for this site during the most recent Call for Sites round. No progress has been made.
- WS6 – Northampton, Jackdaw Close: No support was put forward for this site during the most recent Call for Sites round. No progress has been made.
- WS7 – Wellingborough, Leyland Trading Estate: Permitted for waste use (prior to the adoption of the MWDF Core Strategy in 2010).
- WS8 – Wellingborough, Sidegate Lane: Permitted for waste use – most recent permission for a Resource Recovery Facility (January 2013) remains unimplemented. Landfill operations are permitted until 2017 after which the site will close permanently for the disposal of non-inert waste and then be restored. Support (landowner) for waste uses at the site after closure of the disposal facility was put forward through the recent Call for Sites round.
- WS9 - Corby, Gretton Brook Road: Permitted for waste use and this has been implemented although the facility is not yet built. The permitted area includes part of the allocation and additional land.
- WS10 - Corby, Pilot Road: Permitted for waste use (prior to the adoption of the MWDF Core Strategy in 2010).
- WS12 – Chelveston: Permitted for waste use (prior to the adoption of the MWDF Core Strategy in 2010) and part of the permission has now been implemented.
- WS13 – Nassington, Kings Cliffe Regeneration Centre: Has not been granted permission for waste use however there is support (landowner) for a reduced area of the allocation.

Approach to allocating locations for waste development

3.20. One of the key issues that needs to be addressed through the Update is whether the current approach of allocating three categories of sites (sites for integrated waste facilities, sites in/adjacent to urban areas and sites in rural areas) and industrial estate locations where there is an ‘in principle’ support for waste management uses, is still appropriate.

3.21. The requirement for identifying sites and/or areas for waste management facilities is set out through the European Union Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC (Article 28 – Waste
Management Plans), this is transposed into national policy and regulations. European case law indicates that plans should show proposed sites (allocations) on a map, and/or include sufficiently precise locational criteria for identifying such sites. Government guidance on implementing the Waste Framework Directive (DCLG 2012) considers that locational criteria may include clearly defined locations and/or areas of search and these should be clearly identified in the plan. This is reflected through the NPPW which sets a requirement for plans to identify sites and/or areas for waste management facilities.

3.22. Bearing in mind that national guidance seeks waste plans that identify locations on a plan then it appears that retention of the industrial area designations remains appropriate and that all of the existing ones have a very strong case for remaining in the MWLP. However, there remains a question over if there is still a role for specific allocations and what this should be. As previously noted interest in sites for waste management use is quite fluid, this is because the waste industry is not tied to a particular site and so there is a much wider scope for investment. This, and other factors, has resulted in a low uptake of allocated sites. There also appears to be a reduced requirement for site-specific allocations given the permitted capacity for the various waste management methods.

3.23. Nevertheless site-specific allocations that have implemented permissions would be removed from the plan as allocations as there is no requirement to continue to allocate these sites, this would include sites WS4, WS7, WS8, WS10 and WS12. The remaining site-specific allocations would then include the three integrated waste facilities, two of the seven urban area allocations (both in Northampton and one very small) and two of the three rural allocations remaining.

Call for sites

3.24. A total of 19 sites were brought forward through the Call for Sites process, five of which supported existing allocations. Some of the sites included more than one facility type. The proposed use of the sites included recycling (four), biological processing (four), inert recycling (three), advanced treatment (one), inert landfill (seven), non-inert landfill (three - existing operations) and two were unspecified.

3.25. At this stage of the Local Plan Update the strategic approach to be taken to allocations for waste related development has not yet been determined. Decisions on the strategic approach will have a very significant bearing on the appropriateness of the sites. Once a strategic approach is agreed, industrial areas and allocations that are considered to comply with this approach will be identified, assessed and presented for consultation at the Draft Plan stage.
The distribution of waste management facilities in the Central Spine

3.26. The general policy direction for waste is such that communities should take more responsibility for their own waste. However, the identification of ‘community’ depends on the perspective applied, it could relate to small neighbourhood areas or the community of Northamptonshire as a whole. Hence the need for communities to take more responsibility for their own waste is dependant on the scale applied.

3.27. The Spatial Strategy for Waste Management (Policy 12) in the MWLP seeks a centralised distribution of advanced treatment facilities supported by a network of local and neighbourhood preliminary treatment facilities. The strategy identifies a central spine that runs from Corby through Kettering and Wellingborough to Northampton (refer Appendix 1). Along with Daventry this is where the majority of facilities should be sited. Allocations, and in particular the industrial area location designations, are supportive of this. Some of the urban areas have more industrial areas than others, notably Northampton and in particular Corby, and therefore present greater opportunities for locating waste management uses.

3.28. There is an issue of whether there should be a specific steer within the plan to balance out waste uses across the Central Spine and Daventry. As part of ensuring that communities take more responsibility for their own waste there may be a need to develop a policy approach that seeks to even out the distribution of waste development within the county.
Building in safety and security - Fire safety

3.29. Many solid waste materials are combustible and therefore fires at waste sites may result in substantial property damage and cause harm to people and the environment, including through the release of pollutants via air (from smoke) and water (firewater run-off). There have been several fires at waste sites within Northamptonshire recently. Data from the Environment Agency indicates that within the UK there are around 300 incidences of waste fires every year; the total number of fires has fallen slightly since 2011 however the number of serious and significant fires remains constant.

3.30. Managing fire risk on waste sites is not specifically covered by the NPPF, NPPW or MWLP and so the Local Plan Update provides a timely opportunity to address this matter through the plan-making process and determine if it should be included in the plan as a local policy consideration. The number of waste sites will continue to increase in line with recycling and landfill diversion targets. In addition waste related development is increasingly compatible with industrial development resulting in more facilities located in urban areas near infrastructure, transport routes and communities. As such it is important that due consideration is given to such matters.

3.31. Although this matter could be addressed broadly under the existing Policy 27: Layout and Design Quality, which requires proposals to build-in safety and security, the nature of the risk posed is one that may merit more specific detail. This could be achieved through either an amendment to the existing criterion (of Policy 27) on building in safety and security or by including an additional criterion in to address managing the risk of fires. Where appropriate detailed guidance could also be set out in the Development and Implementation Principles SPD when it is updated. This could include reference to, or aspects of, relevant guidance such as Reducing Fire Risk on Waste Management Sites (issued by the Waste Industry Safety and Health Forum in October 2014), which provides advice and standards on good and acceptable practice to reduce the risk of fire on waste sites.

Issue 6: Managing the risk of fires on waste sites

6A) Should Policy 27: Layout and Design Quality be amended through either an amendment to the existing criterion on building in safety and security or by including an additional criterion in order to address managing the risk of fires? Yes / No.

6B) Should appropriate detailed guidance also be set out in a revision to the Development and Implementation SPD. Yes / No.
Other matters for consideration

3.32. The scope of the MWLP Update has been limited to the locations for minerals and waste related development, distribution of waste management facilities in the central spine and managing fire risk. The MWLP was recently adopted and covers a wide array of matters including local planning considerations. Once the MWLP Update is adopted all of the elements of the MWLP will be up-to-date. If there are any matters that you feel the adopted MWLP does not cover and that would be appropriate to consider through the MWLP Update it is important that these matters are raised at this time so that they can be given due consideration.

Issue 7: Other matters for consideration

Are there any other matters that you consider the Local Plan Update should consider? Yes / No. If yes, please provide details.
Appendix 1: MWLP Key Diagram
## Appendix 2: Initial screening assessment summaries for sites brought forward / supported through the Call for Sites

### Sand and gravel – new potential sites brought forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Denford Meadows       | ![Location map](image) | - Not compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Brought forward by landowner - no operator identified.  
- BGS records indicate presence of river terrace and sub-alluvial sand and gravel deposits, unknown yield and quality.  
- There are several listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments in the local area. Further afield (over 1 km) are the Woodford, Thrapston and Islip Conservation Areas as well as Thrapston Quarry SSSI and the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sand and gravel – new potential sites brought forward | ![Location map](image) | - Not compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Brought forward by landowner and has active industry interest. The site would be worked as an extension to existing operations at Elton Estate (which includes an established processing plant).  
- Site investigations support river terrace sand and gravel deposit with an estimated yield of 0.85 Mt, likely use in concrete and construction materials.  
- There are several listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument in the local area, Elton Hall Registered Park and Garden is located 250m from the site. Fotheringhay Castle Conservation Area and associated Scheduled Monument / listed buildings are further afield.  
- Records indicate presence of several bird species of principal importance. Overwintering Otter are recorded on the river at this location. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Passenham Eastern Extension | ![Map of Passenham Eastern Extension](image)                                                                                                                                                                 | • Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
• Brought forward by industry/landowner as an extension to an existing operation and will utilise existing plant site.  
• Site investigations support river terrace sand and gravel deposits with an estimated yield of 0.15 Mt.  
• Deanshanger and Passenham Conservation Areas, which feature several listed buildings, are located in the local area.  
• Records indicate potential for Great Crested Newt within local area (and possibly the existing quarry). |
### Site Location map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ryehill Farm | ![Location Map](image) | - Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Brought forward by operator (option with landowner).  
- Site investigations support presence of glacial sand and gravel deposits with an estimated yield 1.45 Mt.  
- There are several listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments in the local area.  
- Records indicate that the site supports foraging and commuting bats. |
**Sand and gravel – support received (through the Call for Sites process) for existing allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earls Barton West Extension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brought forward by landowner/operator to be worked as an extension to existing operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site investigations support river terrace sand and gravel deposits with an estimated yield of 3 Mt, likely use in concrete products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The local, and wider, area features a number of historic and environmental designations including: several listed buildings and Schedule Monuments in the local area; Ecton, Earls Barton, Cogenhoe, Great Billing Conservation Areas (500m up to 1.3km away) - all of which feature listed buildings; Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA; and Castle Ashby Registered Parks and Garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports indicate that the site supports low numbers of foraging bats, some Badger and invertebrate interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Location map</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sand and gravel – support received (through the Call for Sites process) for existing allocations | ![Sand and Gravel Support Location Map](image) | • Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
• Comprises two small sites that form part of the larger allocation MA5. Brought forward by landowner – no potential operator identified.  
• BGS records indicate presence of sub-alluvial river terrace sand and gravel deposits. Yield has been estimated at circa 0.15 – 0.2 Mt based on other sites of similar size in the area.  
• The northern site is adjacent (50m) the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA and the southern site is adjacent Castle Ashby Registered Parks and Garden. Further afield there are several listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments.  
• Records indicate presence of several bird species of principal importance. Otter activity and a possible holt has been recorded in the local area. |

Land West of Station Road, Earls Barton
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Heyford | ![Location map](image) | - Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Brought forward by landowner - potential operator identified.  
- Previous site investigations supports the presence of river terrace and glacial sand and gravel deposits with an estimated yield of 1Mt.  
- The site is adjacent Bugbrooke Meadows SSSI, there are several listed buildings in the local area with the Nether Heyford Conservation Area further afield.  
- Records indicate presence of a medium population of Smooth Newt onsite and Great Crested Newt breeding pond in local area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Milton Maisor | ![Location map](image) | - Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Operator identified with an agreement in place with landowner.  
- Site investigations support (glacial) soft sand deposit with an estimated yield of 1.2 Mt.  
- The Milton Maisor and Collingtree Conservation Areas, which feature several listed buildings, are located in the wider area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Passenham South | ![Location map](image)                                                       | - Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP spatial strategy.  
- Brought forward by industry - an agreement with the landowner is in place. The site was granted planning permission in July 2011 (for sand and gravel quarry) subject to a section 106 agreement, the permission will have a ten year implementation period. The site is an extension to an existing operation and will utilise existing plant site. The site is a reduced area from allocation MA7.  
- Site investigation support river terrace sand and gravel deposits with an estimated yield of 0.8 Mt.  
- Deanshanger and Passenham Conservation Areas, which feature several listed buildings, are located in the local area.  
- Records indicate potential for Great Crested Newt within local area (and possibly the existing quarry). |
### Limestone – new potential sites brought forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Easton Lodge | ![Easton Lodge](image) | - Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP development criteria for mineral extraction.  
- Brought forward by landowners – no operator identified. Previous workings in the area demonstrate viability.  
- BGS resource mapping indicates presence of Lincolnshire limestone, this is supported by borehole data for a site previously identified to the east (overlapping this site). Crushed rock with an estimated yield 6.5 Mt.  
- Adjacent (50m) Collyweston Great Wood and Easton Hornstocks National Nature Reserve and SSSI. There are several listed buildings associated with the RAF Wittering base in the local area.  
- Records indicate presence of Dormouse, Palmate Newt and Great Crested Newt within ancient woodland in close vicinity of the site. |
## Limestone - new potential sites brought forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harlestone Quarry Extension | ![Map of Harlestone Quarry Extension](image) | • Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP development criteria for mineral extraction.  
• Site brought forward by operators (agreement with landowners) as an extension to an existing operation.  
• Site investigations support presence of crushed rock and building stone (Northampton Sand Formation) with an estimated yield of 0.85 Mt (0.0425 Mt building stone). Previous workings in the area support viability.  
• There are several listed buildings in the local area with the Lower Harlestone Conservation Area and Althorp Park Registered Parks and Garden further afield.  
• Potential for Dormouse and Great Crested Newt in local area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location map</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pury End Quarry Extension       | ![Location Map](image) | • Generally compliant with the adopted MWLP development criteria for mineral extraction.  
• Site brought forward by operators (agreement with landowners). The site is to be worked as an extension to existing operations – supports viability.  
• Site investigations support presence of Blisworth limestone Building stone and crushed rock with an estimated yield 0.85 Mt.  
• There are several listed buildings in the local area. |