



## Minerals Plan

# Site Assessment Methodology for Allocating Sand and Gravel Sites

October 2015



## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1.0 Introduction.....	3
2.0 Allocation of sites in the Minerals Plan.....	3
3.0 Background.....	4
4.0 National and Local Requirements.....	5
5.0 Site Selection Method.....	7

## **Site Identification and Assessment Methodology for Allocating Sand and Gravel Sites**

### **1.0 Introduction**

This document explains the methodology that Warwickshire County Council has followed to identify, assess and compare potential mineral sites, leading to the allocation of suitable mineral sites in the Minerals Local Plan. The methodology provides the steps carried out to gather robust information and evidence to inform the selection of sites. It is important that the principles established by the methodology accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the national planning practice guidance. This document addressed the following issue:

- The steps taken for the site search, initial assessment, detailed assessment and selection of mineral sites.

**1.1** The methodology has also been prepared to ensure that it satisfies the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal of the Minerals Local Plan, which seeks to assess how potential mineral sites perform against a range of economic, social and environmental objectives. The requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal is an essential part of the process of preparation of the plan and is set out in both European and national legislation. Sustainability Appraisal has a key role in testing alternative options and in providing a sound evidence base.

**1.2** The results of the site assessments are presented and discussed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report which accompanies the Minerals Plan.

### **2.0 Allocation of Sites in the Minerals Local Plan**

**2.1** As mineral planning authority, we are required to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates to meet future demand for sand and gravel in the Plan area. To meet the demand the Minerals Local Plan will need to include suitable sites to allocate for extraction.

**2.2** There are five existing sites in the county with permitted reserves for sand and gravel extraction but only two sites are currently operational.

**2.3** The NPPF (para 145) requires plans to provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregates based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data and a landbank of permitted reserves for sand and gravel of at least

seven years. It also requires mineral planning authorities to ensure that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition. To enable the Council to provide a steady supply of aggregates a number of sites are required to provide annual production at the projected rate over the 15 year plan period.

**2.4** The NPPF (para 156) also says the local plan should include strategic priorities/policies to deliver the provision of minerals. Delivery is therefore a key consideration for the Council not only in producing the plan but ensuring that there are sufficient sites acceptable in planning terms to provide a steady and adequate supply of aggregates during the 15 year plan period.

**2.5** To do this we must identify and assess potential mineral sites and, from a list of potential options, select the sites most suitable for allocation in the Plan.

**2.6** Potential sites will be subject to public consultation through the Plan by providing stakeholders with the opportunity to check that the information used in the assessments is correct. Sites coming forward should be reasonable (realistic and genuinely implementable) subject to public consultation and sustainability appraisal.

### **3.0 Background**

**3.1** The Warwickshire Minerals Local Plan (1995) provides the main development plan policies for determining minerals planning applications in Warwickshire. The Local Plan was saved until September 2007 with the intention of it being replaced by a Minerals Development Framework in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). The Secretary of State approved the saving of a number of policies from the Minerals Local Plan beyond September 2007 therefore, until the Council's emerging Minerals Plan supersedes the Minerals Local Plan once adopted, the saved policies of the Minerals Local Plan 1995 remain in effect.

**3.2** The Revised Spatial Options stage of the emerging Local Plan was consulted on in May 2009 and this contained 27 potential mineral sites of which 23 contained proposals for sand and gravel extraction. As circumstances have changed since 2009 it was necessary to update this work and provide an opportunity for further sites to be considered. Sites that were assessed in 2009 and continued to be promoted have been assessed again as part of this process along with any new sites proposed. Therefore some sites have been assessed in much greater detail than other sites.

- 3.3** The 2009 consultation resulted in a large volume of representations. After the responses to the representations had been prepared the Department for Communities and Local Government wrote to all Waste Planning Authorities advising that waste plans needed to be produced as quickly as possible. As the Waste Development Framework was now the priority, further consultation on the Minerals Local Plan could not take place until the Waste Core Strategy had been adopted.
- 3.4** While the Waste Core Strategy has now been adopted (July 2013) the introduction of the NPPF has placed new requirements on the authority to produce an annual Local Aggregates Assessment and demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Co-operate. The first LAA has been completed (2014) and a further document has been completed in draft form (2015). The Preferred Option and Policies stage has been reached and contains:
- The Council's preferred strategy for locating new mineral development;
  - Draft development plan policies for determining new minerals proposals; and
  - The Council's preferred site allocations for sand and gravel extraction.

#### **4.0 National and Local Requirements**

- 4.1** Minerals are essential to the nation's prosperity and quality of life. It is important that there is an adequate and steady supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings and goods that society, industry and economy needs. It is also important that this provision is made in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF says that " Such provision should take the form of specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria as appropriate"
- 4.2** The online Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (para 010) which supports the NPPF says that "The suitability of each proposed site, whether an extension to an existing site or a new site, must be considered on its individual merits, taking into account issues such as:
- need for the specific mineral;

- economic considerations (such as being able to continue to extract the resource, retaining jobs, being able to utilise existing plant and other infrastructure);
- positive and negative environmental impacts (including the feasibility of a strategic approach to restoration); and
- the cumulative impact of proposals in an area."

4.3 The PPG (para 009) also says "Designating Specific Sites in minerals plans provides the necessary certainty on when and where development may take place. The better the quality of data available to mineral planning authorities the better the prospect of a site being designated as a Specific Site."

4.4 Where mineral development also involves waste management proposals such as the infilling of voids with waste (landfill) to restore the site back to original land levels then consideration needs to be given to the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) published in October 2014 which says at paragraph 5:

"Waste planning authorities should assess the suitability of sites and/or areas for new or enhanced waste management facilities against each of the following criteria:

- The extent to which the site or area will support the other policies set out in this document;
- physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses, and having regard to the factors in Appendix 8 to the appropriate level of detail needed to prepare the Local Plan;
- the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from the resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport; and
- the cumulative impact of existing and proposed waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential."

4.5 However, the identification of sites whether mineral development or waste management proposals does not confer planning permission but it does give an indication of whether or not any proposals are acceptable in planning terms and whether or not planning permission can reasonably be anticipated.

- 4.6 In granting planning permission for mineral development the NPPF (para 144) says that local planning authorities (LPAs) should ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety taking into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality. LPAs also have to ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibration are controlled, mitigated or removed at source and provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards.
- 4.7 Since there are two processes involved in delivering the provision set out in the minerals local plan, allocating a site and granting planning permission for subsequent mineral development, it is important to ensure that the methodology used to allocate sites is based on the "appropriate level of detail needed to prepare the Local Plan".

## **5.0 Site Selection Method**

- 5.1 This methodology seeks to support the identification, assessment and comparison of locations for future mineral extraction in the Plan area. The methodology has been split into four specific steps:
- Step 1 Site Nominations and Initial search
  - Step 2 Initial Assessments and Appraisal of Sites
  - Step 3 Detailed Site Assessments
  - Step 4 Selection of Preferred Sites
- 5.2 A blank mineral site assessment sheet considering the four methodology steps is presented in Appendix 3.
- 5.3 The term "Site" also means a new Greenfield site (including the use of fixed and/or mobile processing plant), an extension to an existing site or a satellite site serving a central processing facility. However it does not include borrow pits. A borrow pit is a "site for the extraction of aggregate minerals over a limited period, for exclusive use in a specific construction project, which will usually be close to or contiguous with the site." (Collation of the Aggregates Minerals 2009 Survey – Appendix G –Glossary)
- 5.4 A site will have a defined boundary or boundaries and will be located within a mineral resource area.



## **Step 1 Site Nominations and Initial Search**

### **Site Nominations**

- 5.5 The initial stage of mineral site selection is to identify areas where mineral sites could be located. This is done by asking for sites to be put forward by landowners, agencies and mineral operators for consideration through a “Call for Sites”. The industry and landowners are well placed to suggest sites for consideration because they will have local knowledge about the quality and viability of the mineral and can provide information about the deliverability of sites. In December 2013/January 2014 (Appendix 1) the Council issued a call for sites for sand and gravel extraction only requesting landowners and minerals operators to submit information including outline proposals on how the site might be worked and restored in support of their request for inclusion of the site in the Plan. Thirty sites (Appendix 2) were put forward for consideration by landowners and the minerals industry although in a number of instances the site contains one of more parcels of land deemed suitable of inclusion by the promoter. In order to secure sufficient information on which to judge the various sites promoters were asked in July 2014 to provide any outstanding information including borehole information so that sites could be assessed in appropriate detail.

## **Step 2 Initial Assessment and Sites Exclusion**

- 5.6 The initial assessment of potential mineral sites involved a desk top study to identify at an early stage all those sites that have a significant constraint and exclude them. It determined if there were any “showstoppers”, if a site has an exclusionary constraint (e.g. sites of international importance for nature) or is not deliverable (e.g. no landowner support/consent). This involved the following steps:
- (a) consider the adequacy and appropriateness of the information submitted by the landowner/mineral operator in support of the proposal and, where appropriate, request further information to clarify the proposal;
  - (b) identify, map and analyse potential constraints and planning information that could affect the site’s inclusion in the plan;
- 5.7 A number of exclusionary questions have been posed at this initial assessment stage. However, for completeness, all 30 sites have been subject to step 3, see below, and the responses to these initial questions have been used again to determine step 4: the selection of the preferred sites.

### **Question 1 – Site availability**

Would the use of this site as a mineral site have the consent of the landowner?

Yes	No
-----	----

***Sites have been excluded if there is no landowner support/consent.***

### **Question 2 – Proven mineral resources**

Does the site contain a proven mineral resource?

Yes	No
-----	----

***Sites have been excluded if it has not been demonstrated that the site contains a proven mineral resource.***

### **Question 3- Adequate potential tonnage**

Does the site provide adequate potential tonnage?

Yes	No
-----	----

### **Question 4 – Access and routing arrangements**

Would the site have a suitable safe access and can it be accessed using routes which are sustainable?

Yes	No
-----	----

### **Question 5 – HS2 Safeguarding Zone**

Would the site be located within the HS2 Safeguarding Zone?

Yes	No
-----	----

***Sites have been excluded if located inside the HS2 Safeguarding Zone***

### **Question 6 – Biodiversity Value**

Would working of the site cause a significant adverse effect (directly or indirectly) on an international or national site of biodiversity value?

Yes	No
-----	----

Internationally designated sites are the most important sites for biodiversity and are legally protected. International sites comprise Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar Sites and candidate SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites.

Nationally designated sites are also legally protected. They comprise Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserves (NNR).

***Sites have been excluded if they would cause a significant adverse effect on an international or national designation either through overlapping physical location or indirect effects. Where this is the case, the assessment against this criteria is not repeated in Step 3.***

### **Question 7 – Geological Value**

Would working of the site cause a significant adverse effect (directly or indirectly) on a national site of geological value?

Yes	No
-----	----

Geological Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are legally protected.

***Sites have been excluded if they would cause a significant adverse effect on a geological SSSI either through overlapping physical location or indirect effects. . Where this is the case, the assessment against this criteria is not repeated in Step 3.***

### **Question 8 – Heritage Assets**

Would working the site cause substantial harm to or total loss of a nationally designated heritage asset or its setting?

Yes	No
-----	----

The NPPF recognises the historic environment as an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to its significance. Heritage assets that are deemed to be of national significance are World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and other sites of national archaeological significance, Listed Buildings, Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest and Historic Battlefields and Military Sites. Substantial harm or loss through alteration or destruction of national heritage asset or development within its setting is not acceptable.

***Sites have been excluded if they would cause substantial harm to a nationally designated asset or its setting. . Where this is the case, the assessment against this criteria is not repeated in Step 3.***

### **Step 3 Detailed Site Assessments**

5.8 The next step was the completion of more detailed site assessments for all sites that were not excluded in Step 2. This provided the necessary information to enable the selection of the preferred sites in Step 4.

5.9 There are a number of land use and planning policy constraints/information which will have the potential to affect the allocation of a site, as follows:

- Biodiversity Value and Legally Protected Species;
- Geodiversity Value;
- Natural Features not subject to statutory protection;
- Heritage Assets;
- Built Character;
- Landscape Character;
- Air Quality;
- Agricultural Land;
- Green Belt;
- Water Quality;
- Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses;
- Flood Risk;

- Flood Alleviation;
- Public Rights of Way;
- Highways Capacity;
- Use of Non-Road Transport Network;
- Airport Safeguarding Zones;
- Coal Referral Areas;
- Economic benefits

5.10 For each of the above criteria, the site assessments were carried out against a set of social, economic and environmental questions. In order to address these questions, a site assessment rationale has been prepared and is presented in Table 1.

5.11 Internal consultees who could provide specialist advice on particular issues were consulted and their advice considered in the assessments. The following consultees were contacted for their advice;

- Ecologist
- Landscape Officer
- Highways and Transport
- Archaeologist

5.12 In order to verify/understand the information contained within a submission, the site was visited and a record made of the key issues likely to influence its further consideration including potential sensitive receptors.

5.13 Table 2 sets the questions and assessment scores that have been considered in the assessments for each of the criteria. Each question sets out an approach to assessment that identifies how a site should be scored based on an established assessment range.

5.14 The result of the Step 3 assessment is a series of positive or negative marks recorded against each question for all sites, which enables comparisons to be made between sites. Sites that are assessed as having a positive impact across a large number of questions will, in general, be the most sustainable. However, where a significant adverse effect (---) is identified, and there is no reasonable opportunity for this impact to be reduced, then it is possible that the site may be considered inappropriate.

5.15 A site will only be excluded at this stage if the constraint is deemed significant. In carrying out the assessment work officers have looked at the extent to which potential constraints could be mitigated against and have taken these into account. For example stand off zones from

properties may address potential noise and dust issues from mineral working. The adequacy of this would be tested more fully at the planning application stage when detailed assessments will be available.

- 5.16 Where mitigation measures are required and a number of sites are identified as having the same impact against a particular question, greater weight may be given to those sites that require no mitigation or alternative measures.

#### **Step 4 Selection of Preferred Sites**

- 5.17 The final criteria used to help select the preferred sites were as follows:

- no insurmountable constraints based on assessments in Steps 2 and 3; and
- deliverability in the plan period taking into account all assessments about the site.

- 5.18 Table 3 sets the questions and assessment scores that have been considered in the assessments in Step 4.

**Table 3 Decision making questions and Scores for Step 4**

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment	
Step 4		
<b>Insurmountable Constraints</b>  Question 28: Are there any insurmountable physical, environmental, planning or ownership constraints that may prejudice the working of the site?	<b>No</b>  No known constraints  OR  Constraints identified but mitigation is possible	<b>Yes</b>  Constraint(s) identified and mitigation unlikely.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for development</b>
<b>Deliverability</b>  Question 29: In the light of the answers to all preceding questions, is the site likely to be deliverable in the Plan period?	<b>Yes</b>  <b>Site is deliverable</b>	<b>No</b>  <b>Site is not deliverable and is not considered for allocation.</b>

**Table 1 Site Assessment Rationale for Step 3**

Criteria/Question	Considerations	Explanation/Constraints
<p><b>Biodiversity Value and Legally Protected Species</b></p> <p>Question 9: Would proposed site affect a site of biodiversity value or affect legally protected species?</p>	<p>* Consider proximity to sites of international/national importance for nature conservation and potential for adverse effects.</p> <p>* Potential for enhancement</p>	<p>*International sites are afforded the highest level of protection. These include Ramsar sites. Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>* Mineral development should not take place where it would adversely affect a site of European Importance.</p> <p>*The likelihood of any adverse impact on National Nature Reserves (NNR) will also be considered.</p> <p>*Many Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are also designated as sites of international importance and there are numerous sites distributed throughout the county. Minerals development should not occur on land within or outside SSSIs if it is likely to have an adverse effect on the SSSI.</p>
<p><b>Geodiversity Value</b></p> <p>Question 10: Would proposed site affect a site of geological value?</p>	<p>Consider location of Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological sites (RIGS)</p>	<p>* Many Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are also designated as sites of international importance and there are numerous sites distributed throughout the county. Minerals development should not occur on land within or outside SSSIs if it is</p>

			likely to have an adverse effect on the SSSI.
<p><b>Natural features not subject to statutory protection</b></p> <p>Question 11: Would proposed site affect natural features that are important for wildlife or landscape character such as trees or hedgerows, or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection?</p>	<p>Consider location of other natural features such Local Wildlife Sites, Ancient Woodlands, trees and woodlands</p>	<p>* Local Wildlife Sites whilst not being afforded statutory protection are important locally and there are many sites distributed throughout the county. Sites within 500m of the proposed mineral site have been considered. The loss of a LWS is likely to have an adverse effect.</p>	
<p><b>Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>Question 12: Would proposed site affect a heritage asset or its settings?</p>	<p>* Consider proximity to a Registered Historic Park or Garden.</p> <p>* Consider proximity to historic site/building/monument with a nationally recognised designation (Heritage assets)</p> <p>* Consider proximity to a Conservation Area (Heritage Asset)</p>	<p>* Presumption in favour of the preservation of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- listed buildings and their settings</li> <li>- nationally important archaeological remains in situ and their settings</li> <li>- the preservation of nationally important archaeological remains if mineral proposals would cause damage or significant harm or less significant (Barnwell case) harm on them.</li> </ul> <p>* Proposals for minerals development should not affect the character or appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>* Although historic parks and gardens have no statutory controls, they should be protected. The effect of a proposed development on a registered park or its setting will be considered.</p>	



<b>Built Character</b>  Question 13: Would proposed site affect the built character of nearby settlement(s)?	* Consider the extent to which the built character of nearby settlements may be affected.	* The extent to which mineral development may inhibit new development (existing /new sites, new buildings etc) from coming forward needs to be considered. The erection of processing plant and provision of new accesses and screening bunds for example close by may also have a harmful effect on settlements particularly if fixed and for a long duration.	
<b>Landscape Character</b>  Question 14: Would proposed site impact on the visual amenity or character of the natural landscape?	* Consider the potential impact on designated landscapes. There are is one AONB within Warwickshire; Cotswolds.  *Potential for enhancement	* The significance of any landscape and visual impact is dependent on a number of site specific issues, such as the proximity to sensitive viewpoints, presence of screening features, direct effects on landscape fabric, proximity to landscape designations and the existing landform	
<b>Air Quality</b>  Question 15: Would the proposed site lie within an Air Quality Management Area, or in close proximity to any significant source(s) of air pollution, or would it affect air quality?	* Adverse emissions can be a concern at some facilities (dealt with at planning application stage if necessary through use of planning controls).  * Consider proximity to sensitive human and business receptors. Proximity to Air Quality Management Areas. There are AQMAs in Rugby, Coleshill (A446/M6), Coventry,	* The impact of development on air quality is likely to be particularly important where the proposed development is within or close to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), where the proposed development could affect air quality such that it may cause an AQMA to be designated.	

	Birmingham, Stratford (town centre) and certain major roads in Leamington and Warwick town centres.	
<b>Agricultural Land</b>  Question 16: Would the proposed site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (1,2 and 3a and 3b)?	<p>* Consider proximity or location of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>* Consider location of sensitive land and soils.</p> <p>* Potential of enhancement.</p>	<p>* The presence of the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) should be taken in to account. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land (grades 3b, 4 and 5) should be used in preference to that of a higher quality. Much of the land within the gravel resource area is of higher agricultural grades, therefore although there will be a preference for finding sites on the lower grade agricultural land, sites on the highest agricultural land may be unavoidable. Loss of agricultural land can be avoided if the site can be restored to its previous grade through acceptable infilling and/or through lower land levels.</p>
<b>Green Belt</b>  Question 17: Would the proposed site harm the Green Belt?	*A large proportion of the county is covered by a swathe of designated Green Belt.	<p>* Unless mineral extraction preserves the openness of the Green belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green belt it will be inappropriate development and cause harm to the Green belt.</p>
<b>Water Quality</b>  Question 18: Could the proposed site potentially affect surface or ground water	* Consider proximity to Source Protection Zones or major/minor aquifers.	* Consider proximity to Source Protection Zones or major/minor aquifers.

quality, in particular water intended for human consumption?	* Consider proximity to vulnerable water bodies.	* Consider proximity to vulnerable water bodies.
<b>Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses</b>  Question 19: Would the proposed site be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses, or would it create a nuisance that will affect existing residents?	The NPPF states that the adverse impact of minerals workings on neighbouring communities should be minimised.  * Consider the proximity of local communities and businesses whose amenity may be impacted by development.	* Noise, dust, smell, light, vibration, air quality, impact on residents and businesses and neighbouring uses, impact on wider areas (users of the countryside)
<b>Flood Risk</b>  Question 20: Would proposed site be vulnerable in terms of flood risk and/or increase the likelihood of risk of flooding elsewhere?	* Areas subject to flooding particularly Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 need close consideration - dependent on type of development.  * Mineral extraction can provide opportunities for flood water and general water storage.	* Areas subject to flooding particularly Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 need close consideration - dependent on type of development.  * Mineral extraction can provide opportunities for flood water and general water storage.
<b>Flood Alleviation</b>  Question 21: Would proposed site result in flood alleviation as part of future mineral restoration?	* Mineral extraction can provide opportunities for flood water and general water storage.	* Mineral extraction can provide opportunities for flood water and general water storage.
<b>PRoW</b>	* Consider the presence of public	* The significance of any impact is dependent upon the location of

Question 22: Would proposed site provide or affect a public right of way?	rights of way (footpaths, bridleways, byways and byways open to all traffic  * Potential for enhancement.	the public rights of way and areas used for recreation.
<b>Highway Capacity</b>  Question 23: Would capacity of the highway network be able to cope with the development of the site?	<p>* The Warwickshire Advisory Lorry Route Map defined in the Warwickshire Transport Plan shows the preferred routes for movements for crossing the county and those movements starting and ending should use them in preference to local lorry routes.</p> <p>* Consider the capacity of the local highway to accommodate an increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>* Consider the extent to which a suitable safe access can be accommodated within the site.</p> <p>Extensions to sites may not require new access points but they may increase production which could lead to an increase in lorries on local</p>	<p>* Minerals have to be worked where they occur therefore they will not always be close to the ALR although access to the ALR is preferred. The use of unsustainable roads for the routing of vehicles should be avoided. Mineral sites should be located close to the ALR and proposals for mineral working should seek to minimise the environmental and amenity aspects of the transportation of minerals.</p> <p>* Distance to market (demand for aggregate) will be considered. Suitable and safe accesses will be required together with sufficient capacity in the local road network.</p>

	roads.	
<p><b>Use of wider non-road transport network</b></p> <p>Question 24: Would the proposed site make use of the wider non-road transport network, including waterways and rail?</p> <p><b>Airport Safeguarding Zones</b></p> <p>Question 25: Would the proposed site impact Airport Safeguarding Zones?</p>	<p>* Consider the extent to which minerals can be transported off site by other means e.g. rail and or canals and overland conveyors</p> <p>* Many types of development can be attractive to birds, including landfill sites, gravel pit restoration schemes and nature reserves.</p>	<p>* The extent to which material can be transported off site by other means will be considered. The likely tonnage (economic viability), distance to suitable networks, the likely development of loading facilities (physically and economically) and the impact of providing links will be considered.</p> <p>* Mineral development sites should not have an adverse impact on the operational integrity or aviation facilities of the airport safeguarding areas of Birmingham and Coventry Airports. The relevant managing bodies will need to be consulted if a site lies within 13km radius of an airport. it may be possible to incorporate mitigation measures to overcome aviation objections.</p>
<p><b>Coal Referral Areas</b></p> <p>Question 26: Would proposed site be located in a Coal Mining Development Referral Area?</p>	<p>* Consider the impact on existing and future coal areas.</p>	<p>* The county is underlain by coal resources which may have been worked in the past or may be worked or developed in the future.</p>
<p><b>Economic Benefit</b></p> <p>Question 27: Would working of the site have a recognised economic benefit for Warwickshire?</p>	<p>* Consider the potential for mineral development to provide economic benefits.</p>	<p>* Mineral development provides opportunities for on- site and off-site employment to be created. Small local firms may seek opportunities to work smaller sites on a campaign basis.</p>

**Table 2 Decision making-questions and assessment scores for Step 3**

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score					
Step 3						
<b>Biodiversity Value and Legally Protected Species</b>  Question 9: Would proposed site affect a site of biodiversity value or affect legally protected species?	<b>(+++)</b>  Existing features and species could be conserved / retained and are likely to be enhanced or new features can be incorporated into the proposal. Effects are associated with national sites and Biodiversity Action Plan species.	<b>(+)</b>  Existing features and species could be conserved/ retained and are likely to be enhanced or new features can be incorporated into the proposal. Effects are associated with local sites.	<b>(0)</b>  No effect / existing features could be conserved or retained.	<b>(-)</b>  Features and species unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures are possible (e.g. by translocation of a legally protected species). Effects are associated with local sites.	<b>(--)</b>  Internationally or nationally protected features are unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures possible (e.g. by translocation of a legally protected species). Effects are associated with protected species or national sites	<b>(---)</b>  Internationally or nationally protected features and protected species unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>
<b>Geodiversity Value</b>  Question 10: Would proposed site affect a site of geological value?	<b>(+++)</b>  Existing features conserved / retained and are likely to be enhanced or new features can be incorporated into the	<b>(+)</b>  Existing features conserved/ retained and are likely to be enhanced or new	<b>(0)</b>  No effect / existing features could be conserved or	<b>(-)</b>  Features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures are possible. Effects are	<b>(--)</b>  Nationally protected features are unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures	<b>(---)</b>  Nationally protected features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score				
	proposal. Effects are associated with national sites.	features can be incorporated into the proposal. Effects are associated with local sites.	retained.	associated with local sites.	possible.  Site may be inappropriate for minerals development
Natural features not subject to statutory protection  Question 11: Would proposed site affect natural features that are important for wildlife or landscape character such as trees or hedgerows, or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection?	(+++)  Existing features can be conserved/retained and there is opportunity for their enhancement or new features can be incorporated into the proposal.	(0)  No effect/ existing features can be retained.		(-)  Features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures possible (e.g. by providing new/replacement features).	(---)  Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation possible.  Site may be inappropriate for minerals development
Heritage Assets  Question 12: Would proposed site affect a heritage asset or its settings?	(+++)  Significant enhancement of an existing heritage asset.	(+)  Minor enhancement (e.g. existing features of significance can be retained and there are some opportunities for their enhancement).	(0)  Unlikely to have a harmful impact upon a heritage asset. Existing features can be retained.	(-)  Likely to have a harmful impact upon those elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. Features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures possible.	(---)  Likely to have a harmful impact upon those elements which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score					
						Site may be inappropriate for minerals development
<b>Built Character</b> Question 13: Would proposed site affect the built character of nearby settlement(s)?	<b>(+++)</b> Significant enhancement (e.g. through redevelopment of a derelict or rundown area).	<b>(+)</b> Could result in an enhancement (e.g. through the sensitive development of an infill site or vacant building).	<b>(0)</b> Unlikely to have an effect / effect very minor.	<b>(-)</b> Could detract from the existing built character. Existing, important features unlikely to be retained in their entirety. Mitigation measures possible.		Could cause a significant detracton from the existing built character. Features unlikely to be retained. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.
<b>Landscape Character</b> Question 14: Would proposed site impact on the visual amenity or character of the natural landscape?	<b>(+++)</b> Low Sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are robust and are able to	<b>(+)</b> Low-medium sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are resilient	<b>(0)</b> Not located within the natural	<b>(-)</b> Low sensitivity: Characteristics of	<b>(--)</b> Medium sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are vulnerable to	<b>(---)</b> High sensitivity: Characteristics of landscape are very



Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score				
	accommodate proposed site without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are very high.	to change and are able to absorb development in many situations without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are high.	landscape.	landscape are not vulnerable to change and proposed site can be absorbed easily.	change and proposed site can be absorbed only in limited situations without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are low. Few aspects of built development relate to landscape character.
<b>Air Quality</b>  Question 15: Would the proposed site lie within an Air Quality Management Area, or in close proximity to any significant source(s) of air pollution, or would it affect air quality?	<b>(+++)</b>  An existing source of air pollution would be removed.	<b>(0)</b>  Within an area where air quality is currently acceptable and not approaching prescribed levels. Unlikely to result in a significant reduction in air quality.	<b>(-)</b>  Within an area where air quality is currently acceptable but approaching prescribed levels. Unlikely to result in the prescribed levels being exceeded.	<b>(--)</b>  Within an area where air quality is over prescribed levels, but mitigation measures would prevent a further decrease in quality or would result in a partial improvement.	vulnerable (Cotswolds AONB) to change and are unable to accommodate proposed site without significant character change; thresholds for significant change are very low. Site workings conflicts directly with landscape character.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>
					Within an area where air quality is over prescribed levels, or development may push air quality over prescribed levels. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for</b>

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score				
					minerals development
<b>Agricultural Land</b>  Question 16: Would the proposed site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (1,2 and 3a and 3b)?	<b>(0)</b>  Land classified as being best and most versatile agricultural land would not be affected.	<b>(-)</b>  Minor loss of best and most versatile agricultural land  OR  significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land but agricultural land can be restored to its original or enhanced state.	<b>(---)</b>  Significant loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and agricultural land cannot be restored to its original or enhanced state.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>		
<b>Green Belt</b>  Question 17: Would the proposed site harm the Green Belt?	<b>(0)</b>  Land classified as Green Belt would not be affected.	<b>(-)</b>  Minor effects on the openness of the Green Belt. Mitigation measures possible.	<b>(---)</b>  Openness of the Green Belt cannot be preserved and/or use conflicts with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>		
<b>Water Quality</b>  Question 18: Could the proposed site potentially affect surface or ground water quality, in particular	<b>(+++)</b>  An existing source of pollution would be removed.	<b>(0)</b>  Surface or ground water quality would	<b>(-)</b>  Potential to affect surface and/or ground water quality generally and affect public drinking water supply	<b>(---</b>	Potential to cause pollution of ground and/or surface water and affect a public drinking water supply. No satisfactory mitigation measures

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score			
water intended for human consumption?		not affected.  Public drinking water supply source would not be affected.	source. Mitigation measures possible.	possible.  Site may be inappropriate for minerals development
Compatibility with Neighbouring Uses  Question 19: Would the proposed site be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses, or would it create a nuisance that will affect existing residents?	(+++)  An existing use that creates a nuisance (e.g. noise, dust, light or pollution) would be removed.	(0)  Compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses.	(-)  Not compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses but mitigation measures possible.	(---)  Not compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  Site may be inappropriate for minerals development
Flood Risk  Question 20: Would proposed site be vulnerable in terms of flood risk and/or increase the likelihood of risk of flooding elsewhere?	(0)  Flood zones 1 (for land which has critical drainage problems), 2, 3a and b would not be affected and/or no risk of localised flooding and/or no increase in the likelihood of risk of flooding elsewhere.	(-)  Flood zones 1 (for land which has critical drainage problems), 2 or 3a and b would be affected. Mitigation measures possible.  Slight risk of localised flooding and /or likelihood of increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Mitigation measures possible.	(---)  Flood zones 1 (for land with critical drainage problems), 2 or 3a and b would be significantly affected and/or significant risk of localised flooding and/or likelihood of significant risk of flooding elsewhere. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  Site may be inappropriate for minerals development	

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score			
<b>Flood Alleviation</b>  Question 21: Would proposed site result in flood alleviation as part of future mineral restoration?	<b>(+++)</b>  Flood alleviation scheme proposed as part of future mineral restoration	<b>(+)</b>  Flood alleviation scheme possible as part of future mineral restoration. Requires further studies.	<b>(0)</b>  No flood alleviation schemes possible.	<b>(---)</b>  Existing green infrastructure or a public right of way are lost, or adversely affected, and public accessibility would be diminished. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>
<b>PRoW</b>  Question 22: Would proposed site provide or affect green infrastructure, or a public right of way?	<b>(+++)</b>  Significant new green infrastructure would be delivered or a public right of way would be created and public accessibility improved.	<b>(+)</b>  Minor opportunities for green infrastructure would be created or a public right of way would be created/improved, or public accessibility improved.	<b>(0)</b>  Existing green infrastructure or a public right of way would be conserved/retained and access maintained.	
			<b>(-)</b>  Existing green infrastructure or a public right of way would be lost and public accessibility would be diminished. Loss is not significant and/or mitigation is possible.	

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score				
<b>Highway Capacity</b>  Question 23: Would capacity of the highway network be able to cope with the development of the site?	<b>(+++)</b>  Improved capacity: no constraints identified and development would improve the capacity of the highway network or an existing access.	<b>(+)</b>  Limited capacity improvement: no constraints identified and development would result in a partial improvement to the capacity of the highway network or an existing access.	<b>(0)</b>  Sufficient capacity: no infrastructure or access constraints.	<b>(-)</b>  Limited/insufficient capacity, or access constraints, which can be overcome. Site may not be suitable for development until infrastructure is in place.	<b>(---)</b>  Insufficient capacity or access constraints cannot be overcome.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>
<b>Use of wider non-road transport network</b>  Question 24: Would the proposed site make use of the wider non-road transport network, including waterways and rail?	<b>(+++)</b>  Use of the rail or waterway network to reduce the transportation of minerals by road can be made and is likely to rely on this type of transportation.	<b>(+)</b>  Limited use of the rail or waterway network to reduce the transportation of minerals by road.	<b>(0)</b>  Use of the rail or waterway network cannot be made.	<b>(---)</b>  Development leads to loss of or damage to the rail or waterway network, or precludes future use of such infrastructure.	<b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score		
<b>Airport Safeguarding Zones</b>  Question 25: Would the proposed site impact Airport Safeguarding Zones?	<b>(0)</b>  Not located within a 13km radius of an airport.	<b>(-)</b>  Within a 13km radius of an airport and mitigation measures can be incorporated to overcome aviation objections	<b>(---)</b>  Within a 13km radius of an airport. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>
<b>Coal Referral Areas</b>  Question 26: Would proposed site be located in a Coal Mining Development Referral Area?	<b>(0)</b>  A Coal Mining Development Referral Area would not be affected.	<b>(-)</b>  A low risk Coal Mining Development Referral Area would be affected and hazards can be mitigated.	<b>(---)</b>  A high risk Coal Mining Development Referral Area would be affected and hazards cannot be mitigated.  <b>Site may be inappropriate for minerals development</b>

Criteria and Decision-making question	Assessment score				
<p><b>Economic Benefit</b></p> <p>Question 27: Would working of the site have a recognised economic benefit for Warwickshire?</p>	<p><b>(+++)</b></p> <p>Significant benefit for the most deprived areas through creation of new employment and create wider economic opportunities.</p>	<p><b>(+)</b></p> <p>Would have an identifiable benefit for a deprived area through creation of new employment.</p>	<p><b>(0)</b></p> <p>Would not provide a benefit to a deprived area or create new economic opportunities.</p>	<p><b>(-)</b></p> <p>May have a detrimental impact on a deprived area. Mitigation measures possible.</p>	<p><b>(---)</b></p> <p>Would have a significant detrimental impact on a deprived area. No satisfactory mitigation measures possible.</p> <p><b>Site may be inappropriate for development</b></p>

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Call for Sites Request December 2013 – Letter and Pro forma.**

Date as postmarked

Dear sir/madam,

#### **Warwickshire Minerals Plan (Preferred Options) - Request for sand and gravel sites**

Warwickshire County Council has restarted work on its Minerals Plan (formerly called the 'Minerals Core Strategy') following the successful adoption of the County's Waste Core Strategy in July 2013.

At the last Minerals Plan stage, we consulted on a '[Revised Spatial Options](#)' document, which set out three strategy options and a number of site submissions for working different minerals. We received a large number of responses which we have added to our database and analysed.

We intend to build on the last consultation by producing a 'Preferred Option and Policies' document with consultation scheduled for mid-2014. However, the Council intends to now include specific site allocations for sand and gravel extraction only, with all other mineral extraction or working dealt with through specific policies.

We are therefore requesting that if you, or your clients, have sites for sand and gravel extraction that you would like to submit for consideration as potential Minerals Plan allocations then please complete and supply the attached pro-forma and supporting plans. In addition to the pro forma and plans, it will also be helpful to your case to submit as much of the following information as possible:

- ☐ A letter from the landowner giving consent to develop the site for mineral extraction.
- ☐ A plan showing any boreholes and trial pits with a summary of the findings and any other geological evidence such as a plan showing isopachytes for mineral and overburden.
- ☐ An indicative plan showing the method of winning and working the mineral i.e. the extent of working, the direction of working, position of access, stand-off zones, restoration phasing, locations for processing and stocking the mineral, soil and overburden storage areas, site access and facilities for mine waste disposal, timescales for the operation and phasing.
- ☐ An indicative plan showing outline restoration zones, approximate final restored ground levels, details of how flood storage capacity can be generated, and explanation of how Biodiversity Action Plan targets may be achieved.
- ☐ A description of the likely end destinations of each mineral, the potential routes to reach the destination(s) and approximate number of daily lorry journeys required (if you have not already submitted this information).
- ☐ Where particular constraints have been identified such as ecological, archaeological, geological and landscape, proposed measures outlining mitigation should be submitted.



- ☐ Evidence of any consultations /meetings with local groups and Parish Councils.
- ☐ Evidence or other information that would help in assessing that amenity impacts could be minimised and mitigated against.
- ☐ Any other information that you would like to submit which could help your submission.

If you have submitted sites previously for sand and gravel extraction and the sites are still available for development, please confirm that you would like the particular site(s) to be reconsidered.

Please email the information to [planningstrategy@warwickshire.gov.uk](mailto:planningstrategy@warwickshire.gov.uk) or post to Planning Policy, Warwickshire County Council, Shire Hall, Barrack Street, PO Box 43, Warwick, CV34 4SX.

Please note that all information should be submitted by **28<sup>th</sup> February 2014**.

If you require any further information or would like to discuss anything please contact the Planning Policy team on 01926 41 2391.

Yours sincerely  
Tony Lyons  
Principal Planning Officer  
Planning Policy Team

<b>General Details</b>	
Site name	
Address	
Grid reference	
Parish	
Area (hectares)	
Developer	
Landowner	
Mode of transport for mineral	
Extension to existing works? <sup>*1</sup>	
<b>Site Plan Included</b>	
Location of site access indicated	
Route to Preferred Lorry Network <sup>*2</sup>	
Settlements and constraints <sup>*3</sup>	
Flood map (fluvial, surface water etc.)	
Location of processing plant	
Ancillary developments required?	
International, National, Regional and Local designations <sup>*4</sup> including the following sites, assets or features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecological (SAC, SSSI etc.)</li> <li>- Archaeological</li> <li>- Historic/cultural assets</li> <li>- Landscape (AONB etc.)</li> <li>- Geological (SSSI, LGS etc)</li> </ul>	
<b>Operational Details</b>	
Geological formation and details	
End uses of mineral	
Estimated resource (tonnes)	
Overburden thickness and details	
Estimated annual output (tonnes)	
Estimated duration of operations	
Estimated daily vehicle movements	
Destination of mineral, market or further processing facility.	
Will extraction occur around or below the water table?	
<b>Environmental Information</b>	
Does the site effect agricultural grades 1, 2 and 3a – “best and most versatile”?	
Estimated impact on local ecology and	

biodiversity	
Groundwater Protection Zones	
Estimated impact on overall hydrology of the area.	
Does the site lie within an aerodrome safeguarding area? <sup>*5</sup>	
<b>Restoration Options</b>	
Please provide outline details of the restoration scheme including:	
What are the proposed site after-uses?	
If agricultural land (grade 1, 2, 3a and 3b) is affected, can it be restored to its original or enhanced state?	
Will the site require the importation of inert and other waste streams? If yes how much approximately (tonnes)?	
Will the site offer opportunities for biodiversity and habitat enhancement? Can it make a contribution to the Warwickshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAPs)?	
Can the site offer opportunities for schemes for flood risk management?	

\*1  
Ext  
ensi  
on  
refe  
rs  
to

development which would be contiguous with an existing, dormant or unrestored site

\*2 Warwickshire Advisory Lorry Route Map (2005), available at [www.warwickshire.gov.uk/hgv](http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/hgv).

\*3 The location of urban areas, settlements and residential and other land uses.

\*4 Sites designated International, National, Regional, and Local Importance – European designated sites that form part of the Natura 2000 network (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) )

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

Sites of Special Scientific Interests (SSSI)

Ancient semi-natural woodland

Scheduled Monuments

Registered Historic Battlefields

Registered Parks and Gardens

Listed Buildings

Conservation Areas

Local Geological Sites (LGS)

Local Wildlife Sites (LWS)

Local Nature Reserves

Features of local archaeological importance identified on the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record

\*5 i.e. within 13km of official safeguarded civil aerodromes or 8 miles of military aerodromes

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **List of the 30 sites**

## **MINERALS SITES**

### **(PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION, 2015 )**

#### **Preferred sites X9**

<b>SITE NUMBER</b>	<b>SITE NAME</b>
1	Bourton on Dunsmore, Straight Mile
2	Lawford Heath
3	Shawell Quarry Extension
4	Land at Wasperton Hill Farm, Barford
5	Glebe Farm, Wasperton
6	Coney Grey Farm, Ryton
7	Lower Farm, Salford Priors
8	Broom Court Farm, Bidford
9	Ham's Lane, Lea Marston

#### **Rejected Sites**

<b>SITE NUMBER</b>	<b>SITE NAME</b>
10	Barn Covert, Lea Marston
11	Marston Fields Farm, Lea Marston
12	Dunton Island, Lea Marston
13	Red House Farm, Offchurch
14	Packington, Site A
15	Packington, Site B
16	Glebe Farm, Fenny Drayton
17	Land at Baginton
18	Church Farm, Sherbourne
19	Millers Bank, Dunnington
20	Broom Lake, Dunnington
21	Berry Coppice, Dunnington
22	Brinklow
23	Barnwell's Barn Farm, Lawford Heath
24	Dunkley's Farm, Lawford Heath
25	Weston-under-Wetherley
26	Burton Hastings
27	Polesworth
28	Broom Farm, Waterloo Road, Bidford
29	Tower Hill Farm, Bidford
30	Land at Clifton on Dunsmore

## APPENDIX 3

# Blank Mineral Site Assessment Sheet

[illegible]