DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE MINERALS PLAN

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AT SAND AND GRAVEL DROP-IN SESSIONS

MARCH 2013
Foston & Scropton Parish Hall, 24 September 2012

41 people attended.

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

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

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

The cumulative impact of another industry operating in a rural area already the focus of major employers, such as Cranberry Foods and the proposed pig farm was raised as an issue. It was suggested that increasingly there seems to be more employment than people living in the area. Again, the issue of traffic passing through the village was raised in this respect.
Barrow on Trent Village Hall, 26 September 2012

17 people attended.

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

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

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

The environmental sensitivity mapping project being undertaken by the council’s Landscape Team was well received and helped people to understand the proposed long term restoration strategy for the Trent Valley.
Weston on Trent Village Hall, 28 September 2012

39 people attended.

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

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

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

The potential impact on Kings Mill Lane was also raised by a significant number of people. It was considered generally that the provision of a bridge across the river from Kings Mill Lane would be a good community benefit resulting from the working of the quarry. The improvement of the canal towpath in the area was also raised in this respect, as were improved community facilities such as buses and shops.
Repton Village Hall, 4 October 2012
Over 150 people attended.

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

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

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

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

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

No specific comments were raised about the suggested extension to the Willington Quarry.
Elvaston Village Hall, 5 October 2012

25 people attended.

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

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

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

In terms of restoration, people questioned whether it would be returned to an agricultural end use, or left as an open body of water.
Egginton Village Hall, 18 October 2012

52 people attended.

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

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

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

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

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

The construction of the new gas pipeline through part of the site was raised. Concern was expressed over how this would be protected.
Long Eaton Library, 8 November 2012

19 people attended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Generally people would prefer to see the site restored to agriculture rather than another area of water. They were assured to learn that only inert fill could be used and it would not become a landfill site.
Shardlow Village Hall, 22 November 2012
42 people attended.

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

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

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

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

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

Most people thought that the apportionment figure in the Local Aggregate Assessment should be revised downwards to take greater account of the economic conditions.
Sudbury Parish Room, 13 December 2012

17 people attended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

People generally wanted the site restored back to agricultural use.

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

There was no overall consensus on the question in the overall strategy as to whether extraction should take place in this area of the Dove Valley or whether it should continue in the Trent Valley. Some accepted that sand and gravel is a resource that has to be used and expected extraction to take place at some point, while others thought the area should be protected from extraction, given the conservation value of the area.