

# DERBYSHIRE AND DERBY MINERALS LOCAL PLAN

## SITE ASSESSMENT NEW PARISH QUARRY, DARLEY DALE

DECEMBER 2016

Derbyshire County Council and Derby City Council (the mineral planning authorities) are working together to prepare a joint minerals local plan. It will be called the Derbyshire and Derby Joint Minerals Local Plan and cover the geographical area of Derbyshire, excluding the Peak District National Park. It will cover the period to 2030.

Minerals are essential raw materials, which are used to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that our country needs. They are vital for economic growth and our quality of life. They are, however, a finite resource and can only be worked where they are found. It is important, therefore, that we make the best use of them to enable their long term conservation.

The Plan area has a wealth of mineral resources. Mineral extraction and development has, for a long time, been a part of the Derbyshire landscape and an important part of the local economy, making an important contribution to the national, regional and local need for minerals. Whilst mineral working can also provide environmental benefits, residents and local businesses are often concerned about any unwelcome impacts.

**The Councils carried out extensive consultation during 2015 and 2016 in the form of series of papers, which sought to develop further the emerging vision and objectives, strategies and policies of the Minerals Local Plan. The comments and suggestions made at this stage will be used to feed into the Draft Minerals Local Plan. We will ask for your views on this document in 2017.**

**During the 2015 and 2016 Consultation, the Councils sought your views on issues relating to the development of a strategy for the provision of building and roofing stone. Generally, (in the absence of any specific sites being promoted) people supported the proposed criteria based policy for determining any proposals that**

may come forward for building stone quarries during the course of the Plan period. The 2015/2016 Consultation also included a Paper, which set out a proposed Site Assessment Methodology that would be used to assess hard rock quarries for their suitability as allocations in the Plan.

However, in October 2016, after this consultation had ended, a mineral operator submitted this site at New Parish Quarry, Darley Dale for consideration in the Local Plan. Firstly, therefore, we have to reconsider the overall Strategy in light of this. Secondly, we need to assess the site for its suitability as an allocation in the Plan. Being a hard rock resource, it is considered appropriate to use the Site Assessment Methodology described above for assessing this site. It has therefore been used to carry out an initial assessment of this site.

This consultation is now being undertaken to inform people about the submission of this site and to ask for their views, including on the methodology and initial assessment, as well as the revised Strategy for Building Stone. All comments will help in finalising the assessment and therefore in determining whether the site has the potential to be included as an allocation in the Plan. An allocation of land in a local plan is acceptance, in principle, that a site is suitable for working, subject to satisfying detailed planning considerations.

## **Contents**

- 1 Introduction and Background
- 2 New Parish Quarry, Darley Dale
- 3 Sources of Information for the Assessment
- 4 Site Assessment
- 5 Conclusions
- 6 Summary of Assessment

## 1. Introduction and Background

The 2015/2016 Consultation 'Towards a Minerals Local Plan' included a Paper about developing a Strategy for Building Stone. People generally favoured the option of developing a criteria based policy against which to assess proposals which come forward for building stone quarries during the Plan period rather than allocating specific sites. The 2015/2016 Consultation also contained Papers setting out methodologies for assessing sites that have been put forward for possible allocation in the Plan; one for alluvial sand and gravel sites and another for hard rock quarries. It is the Methodology for Assessing Hard Rock Quarries that will be used to assess this site. On the whole this proposed methodology received favourable comments; it has been amended slightly to address concerns raised during the consultation process. It is this revised methodology will be used to assess the promoted site.

The revised Site Assessment Methodology, together with information about its development and intended use can be found in the following Paper:

Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan –  
Site Assessment Methodology: Hard Rock Quarries, November 2016

## 2. New Parish Quarry, Darley Dale

A new quarry is proposed off Bent Lane, Darley Dale, which would produce building stone. The site is 15.7 hectares and is currently used for grazing. It has been estimated that between 500,000 and 800,000 tonnes of the product will be extracted over a 20 year period from 2019 to 2039.

## 3. Sources of Information for the Assessment

The following documents provide the main sources of information used to assess the site:

- Derbyshire and Derby MLP Questionnaire for promoted sites

The following information has been mapped:

Site location, resource, site access and proposed lorry route, water designations, environmental and heritage assets, landscape character, 200m and 500m buffer zones.

The Maps can be found in the following Paper:

Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan –  
Site Assessment Maps: Parish Quarry

## 4. Site Assessment

The Assessment process is intended to discover any positive factors that would support the allocation of the site and any negative factors against its allocation. These factors are then categorised as having a major or minor impact. In some cases, the criteria has been categorised as only having a minor impact on the potential allocation of the site from the outset.

PMAJ - Major positive factor in favour of allocation

PMIN - Minor positive factor in favour of allocation

NMIN - Minor negative factor against favouring an allocation

NMAJ – Major negative factor against favouring an allocation

| Criteria                 | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact      | Indicators   | Assessment  |
|--------------------------|---------------|---|----------------------|--|---|
| <b>Economic Criteria</b> |               |   |                      |  |   |
| Need for the mineral     | 01            | Whilst NPPF does not set out that MPAs should plan for a steady and adequate supply of building stone, it requires that local plans should consider how to meet any demand for small scale extraction of building stone and recognise the small scale nature of building stone quarries. Is there an identified need for additional reserves to be worked over the Plan period? | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMAJ | Detailed evidence to support the need for reserves to be worked at the quarry over the Plan period<br>Some evidence to support the need for reserves to be worked at the quarry over the Plan period<br>Insufficient evidence to support the need for reserves to be worked at the quarry over the Plan period | It has been estimated that between 500,000 and 800,000 tonnes of blockstone will be extracted over a 20 year period. No substantive and conclusive evidence has been submitted to justify why these resources need to be worked at this site over the Plan period, given that other similar reserves are available at the adjacent Hall Dale Quarry, which will last through the Plan period. <b>NMAJ</b> |
| Quality/yield of mineral | 02            | NPPF requires local plans to deliver development and therefore the economic viability of development is an important consideration. Is the reserve quality/yield sufficient to suggest extraction would be economically viable during the plan period?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMAJ | Detailed geological evidence to support the quality/yield of the deposit (boreholes)<br>Some geological evidence to support the quality/yield of the deposit (mapped)<br>Insufficient evidence to support the quality/yield of the deposit   | Some general geological information has been submitted which would appear to indicate the quality and quantity of the deposit. <b>PMIN</b>  |

| Criteria                     | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact      | Indicators  | Assessment   |
|------------------------------|---------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| Use of mineral resources     | 03            | NPPF recognises that minerals are a finite resource and therefore it is important to make the best use of them in order to ensure their long term conservation.<br>Is the use proposed appropriate for the type of mineral?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMAJ | Detailed evidence provided to justify that the end use is appropriate for the mineral<br>Some evidence provided to justify that the end use is appropriate for the mineral<br>Insufficient evidence provided to justify that the end use is appropriate for the mineral | Evidence has been provided to indicate that the resource is of a quality which can be used for building purposes. <b>PMIN</b>  |
| Location of Processing Plant | 04            | Market areas vary greatly for minerals depending on their type from international, national or more local. Where relevant an assessment will be made on the appropriateness of the location of the site to intended market.<br>Is the site appropriately located in relation to the market it is intended to serve?                | PMIN<br>NMIN         | The site is well located to serve its intended market<br>The site is not well located to serve its intended market  | The stone would be used UK wide. In this respect, a central location within the UK would not seem inappropriate. <b>PMIN</b>   |
| Existing Infrastructure      | 05            | Mineral processing plant/infrastructure can be expensive to develop and therefore NPPG states that economic considerations such as the utilisation of existing plant and infrastructure should be taken into account.<br>Is there existing infrastructure that would be utilised by the proposed operation to process the mineral? | PMIN<br>NMIN         | Yes, existing infrastructure exists on or adjacent to the site<br>No, new infrastructure would be required to process the mineral   | This would be a new quarry for which new infrastructure would be required. <b>NMIN</b>   |
| Sterilisation of Resources   | 06            | NPPF recognises that minerals are a finite resource and therefore it is important to make the best use of them, including avoiding their sterilisation, in order to ensure their long term conservation.<br>In some cases it might be that if a site isn't allocated to be worked as part of a current                             | PMIN<br>NMIN         | Yes The site is likely to be sterilised if not allocated<br>No The site is unlikely to be sterilised if not allocated due to its scale/location   | The site does not need to be worked in this plan period and there is no specific or valid reason why it would be sterilised if it wasn't allocated for working at this time. Also, its working does not relate to the working of an existing quarry. <b>NMIN</b> |

| Criteria                       | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact                          | Indicators  | Assessment   |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|--|
|                                |               | operation its' scale or location would affect the likelihood of it being worked in the future effectively sterilising the resource.<br>If the site wasn't allocated would the mineral resources be sterilised from future working due to its location/scale?<br>In many cases a new operation will not be the result of an existing site being abandoned and this will not be an issue.   |  |   |  |
| Employment                     | 07            | The minerals industry can provide an important source of local employment. NPPG states that economic considerations such as the retention of jobs should be taken into account. Is it likely that the proposal would lead to the retention of jobs at a currently operational site to the benefit of the local community? Would it be the continuation of an existing operation or a new operation?   | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br><br>NMIN                 | A new operation which would result in new jobs<br>Working of the site would enable a continuation of the operation leading to the retention of existing jobs at an existing quarry or A new operation that would not result in net job losses<br>A new operation but which would result in job losses elsewhere   | The proposal is presented as a new operation. As a result, it has to be assumed that some new jobs would be created. <b>PMAJ</b>   |
| <b>Social Criteria</b>         |               |   |  |   |  |
| Duration of mineral extraction | 08            | NPPF requires the cumulative impact of proposals to be taken into account; the duration of the operation should be a consideration. The duration of mineral extraction will affect the overall scale of impact on local communities. What is the intended timeframe for working the site (i.e. short term 0-10 years etc.?)   | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ             | Short term 0-9 years<br>Medium term 10-19 years<br>Long term 20-29 years<br>Very long term 30+ years  | It has been indicated that the quarry would be worked over a 20 year period from 2019 to 2039. <b>NMIN</b>   |
| Visual Intrusion               | 09            | NPPG advises that visual intrusion is a consideration that needs to be taken into account. Visual intrusion covers impact of the workings in relation to nearby communities and impact on landscape during and after working. This section covers impact on communities. Impact on landscape character will be dealt with separately. Assessment makes a judgement of visual impact on 'sensitive receptors'. In terms of visual impact these have been classed as occupied | PMAJ<br><br>PMIN<br><br>NMIN<br><br>NMAJ | The site has few or no visually sensitive receptors and/or only small parts of the site will be visible from them.<br>The site has few visually sensitive receptors but large parts (or more than one part) of the site will be visible from them.<br>The site has some visually sensitive receptors and/or some parts of the site will be visible from them.<br>The site has many visually sensitive receptors and/or large parts (or more than one part) of the site will be visible from them. | The site is visible from the adjacent Burley Fields Farm and from the footpath that follows the western boundary of the site. Although many of the properties to the south which lie close to the site are screened by mature trees, the site is highly visible in the longer distance from properties on the hillside on the other side of the Derwent Valley in Wensley, Oker and Snitterton, particularly, and from the hillside above Two Dales to the south east. <b>NMAJ</b> |

| Criteria      | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact              | Indicators   | Assessment  |
|---------------|---------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|
|               |               | residential properties and places where people go e.g. schools/hospitals/community centres/leisure facilities. Public Rights of Way have also been included in this assessment. The assessment takes into account as far as possible; proximity to sensitive receptors<br>topography of site<br>existing screening measures  |                              |  |   |
| Noise         | 10            | NPPG advises that noise is a consideration that needs to be taken into account particularly where noise sensitive properties are affected. The effects of noise need to be evaluated, controlled or mitigated.<br>At this stage the only factor that we can measure is the proximity of the site to noise sensitive areas and properties which would be adversely affected by an increase in noise levels. These would normally include dwellings/places of worship/educational establishments/hospitals/ livestock farms/ some factories or any other property likely to be adversely affected by an increase in noise levels.<br>NPPG states that Mineral planning authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level ( $L_{A90,1h}$ ) by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900).<br>The assessment takes into account the number of sensitive receptors within 200 and 500m of site. | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | The site has no noise sensitive receptors within 500m of the boundary of the site<br>The site has few noise sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site and some within 500m<br>The site has no or few noise sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site and many within 500m<br>The site has many noise sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site | There is one property within 200m of the proposed site and a further twenty one within 500m of the site. <b>NMIN</b>  |
| Nuisance Dust | 11            | NPPG advises that dust is a consideration that needs to be taken into account. This criteria deals with nuisance dust only. Dust likely to cause harm to human health is dealt with under air quality.<br>The location of residential areas, schools and other dust-sensitive land uses should be  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN         | The site has no high/medium dust sensitive receptors within 500m of the boundary of the site<br>The site has few high/medium dust sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site and some within 500m<br>The site has no or few high/medium dust sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site and  | There is only one property within 200m of the site but over twenty one within 500m of the proposed site, although most of these are well shielded by mature trees in dense woodland.<br><b>PMIN</b> |

| Criteria                     | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact      | Indicators  | Assessment                                   |
|------------------------------|---------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
|                              |               | <p>identified in relation to the site, as well as proposed or likely sources of dust emission from within the site.</p> <p>The assessment should explain how topography may affect the emission and dispersal of site dust, particularly the influence of areas of woodland, downwind or adjacent to the site boundary, and of valley or hill formations in altering local wind patterns.</p> <p>Large dust particles (&gt;30um), which make up the greatest source of dust emitted from mineral workings will largely deposit within 100m of sources. Intermediate sized particles (10-30um) are likely to travel up to 200-500 m.</p> <p>Large/intermediate particles are classed as nuisance dust.</p> <p>Assessment takes into account the number of high/medium dust sensitive properties within 200 and 500 metres of sites i.e. area where large/intermediate dust particles are likely to deposit.</p> | NMAJ                 | <p>many within 500m</p> <p>The site has many high/medium dust sensitive receptors within 200m of the boundary of the site</p> |  |
| Air Quality/<br>Human Health | 12            | <p>Smaller particles (&lt; 10um) which make up a small proportion of dust emitted from most mineral workings can travel up to 1000m or more. These small particles (PM10s) are associated with effects on human health. NPPG states that measures to control fine particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>) to address any impacts of dust might be necessary if, within a site, the actual source of emission (e.g. the haul roads, crushers, stockpiles etc.) is in close proximity to any residential property or other sensitive use. Unacceptable levels of PM10s are one factor that may result in the establishment of an Air Quality Management Area to address the problem. The presence of such an area has been regarded as an indicator that air quality is poor therefore might constrain the location of</p>  | PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | <p>Site does not lie within 1000 m of an AQMA</p> <p>Site lies within 1000m of an AQMA</p> <p>Site lies within an AQMA</p>    | There are no AQMAs in this area. <b>PMIN</b> |

| Criteria   | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact              | Indicators  | Assessment   |
|--|---------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
|  |               | additional dust generating development. Given that PM10s can travel up to and over 1000m, this has been used as a cut-off point.  |                              |   |  |
| Blasting /Vibration  | 13            | NPPG advises that blast vibration is a consideration that needs to be taken into account. Blasting is often a major cause of concern to residents close to mineral workings. Disturbance is dependent on the quantity of explosive used, the distance to the receptor, the geology of the site and atmospheric conditions. The impact of blasting is a matter not normally addressed in detail at the 'site allocation' stage but as a practical 'rule of thumb' a 200 metre buffer zone is considered more than adequate to protect sensitive receptors from the impacts of blasting.  | PMIN<br>NMIN                 | Distance to nearest sensitive receptor is over 200 metres<br>Distance to the nearest sensitive receptor is within 200 metres.   | Unlike aggregates quarrying, extraction of building stone does not generally use high explosives, because of the need to recover large, undamaged blocks from the quarry face; blasting would seriously affect the structure and size of the stone. Much quarrying of building stone today is undertaken by mechanical means. Rock is usually extracted from the face by an excavator. <b>PMIN</b>   |
| Transport – Local Amenity                                  | 14            | NPPG advises that traffic is a consideration that should be taken into account. The movements of minerals and importation of fill material for restoration can generate large volumes of traffic, mainly heavy goods vehicle (HGVs). Such traffic can impact on communities causing problems such as public safety, noise and vibration, air pollution and visual intrusion. These problems are most severe where HGVs use roads unsuited to their weight and size, where they pass through sensitive areas and at the access to the site from the public highway. Will associated mineral traffic pass through sensitive areas on the way to the strategic road network? | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | HGVs would have to pass no sensitive receptors between the site and the start of the local strategic network (A Class Road or designated freight routes)<br>HGVs would have to pass few sensitive receptors between the site and the start of the local strategic network (A Class Road or designated freight routes)<br>HGVs would have to pass some sensitive receptors between the site and the start of the local strategic network (A Class Road or designated freight routes)<br>HGVs would have to pass many sensitive receptors between the site and the start of the local strategic network (A Class Road or designated freight routes) | There are six residential properties between the quarry and the first A class road which is the A632 Matlock Chesterfield Road.<br><b>NMIN</b>   |
| Transport - Safe and effective access to and from the site | 15            | What are the proposed access arrangements for the site?   | PMAJ<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ         | Proposed access to current highway standards<br>Proposed access not to current highway standard but no pattern of existing collisions at access location or no existing access , but subject to agreement with local highway authority new access likely to be accepted<br>Proposed access not to current highway standard and current pattern of existing collisions at access location or no existing   | The additional HGV movement, combined with agricultural and general traffic using Bent Lane is likely to significantly increase the risk of vehicle conflict along this single track route. It is likely an acceptable arrangement could be designed to serve the site, however, it is likely to require some roadside vegetation to be removed to achieve satisfactory visibility sightlines and additional carriageway construction would be |

| Criteria  | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact              | Indicators  | Assessment  |
|---|---------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
|   |               |   |                              | access and subject to agreement with local highway authority<br>new access unlikely to be acceptable.   | likely to be required to accommodate the turning manoeuvres of an articulated /rigid HGV. <b>NMIN</b>   |
| Transport – Export route (vehicular)                          | 16            | What is the main export route (vehicular) from the site?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | Direct onto the strategic road network (I.e. and A class road or a road that is a designated freight route.<br>Direct onto a B class road with short haul to strategic road network<br>Direct onto a B class road but with long haul to strategic road network<br>Direct on to minor roads unsuitable for HGVs  | The applicant proposes to improve the access onto Bent Lane which is a minor road and the lorries would travel about 2 miles to the nearest B class road and a further mile to the A632. The proposed lorry route along Bent Lane is not considered to be of a standard and construction that would be suitable for regular and prolonged use by HGVs. It is very narrow with often fairly steep sides. Any improvement such as widening would have a detrimental impact on the amenity and appearance of the area. The additional HGV movement, combined with agricultural and general traffic using Bent Lane is likely to significantly increase the risk of vehicle conflict along this single track route. <b>NMAJ</b> |
| Transport - Capacity for sustainable transport options        | 17            | NPPF promotes the use of alternatives to road transport provided that they are environmentally preferable. This helps to reduce carbon emissions thus reducing the impacts on the climate.<br>Is an alternative mode of transport to road proposed? | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN         | All material would be transported by rail or canal<br>Some material would be transported by rail or canal<br>All material would be transported by road  | The applicant has set out that all material would be transported by HGV. There are no alternative modes of transport that are available in this location. <b>NMIN</b>   |
| Benefits from the working, restoration and proposed after-use | 18            | NPPF advises that the positive benefits of mineral working should be taken into account. What are the overall potential benefits from the proposed working, restoration and after-use of the site?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | Economic, social and environmental benefits would arise<br>Two of the above benefits would arise<br>One of the above benefits would arise<br>No benefits would arise  | <b>This criteria focuses on any benefits that may arise from the proposal.</b> A small number of jobs would be created if the quarry opened. The applicant also proposes a restoration scheme which increases biodiversity and provides recreation areas. As a result, there may be some economic and environmental benefits arising from the proposal. <b>PMIN</b>   |
| Cumulative impact   | 19            | Cumulative impact arises not only from successive mineral operations in the same area, but also coupled with other types of commercial activity, which may have an impact on an area over time.   | PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ         | There are no significant impacts of past or present mineral extraction or other significant commercial activity in the area.<br>There are not any current mineral workings in the area but there have been workings in the recent past and there is other commercial activity in the area.<br>There is a concentration of mineral workings and other commercial activity in the areas, which currently have, or have had, impacts either concurrently or successively over a long period of time. | Hall Dale quarry, which produces building stone, lies adjacent to this site and has operated for some time and continues to do so. This is not however considered to be a significant impact because of the small and intermittent scale of quarrying. <b>PMIN</b>  |
| <b>Environmental Criteria</b>                                 |               |   |                              |   |   |

| Criteria                        | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact                        | Indicators   | Assessment  |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|---|
| Water Environment – Flood Risk  | 20            | <p>The EA designates flood zones which are susceptible to different risks of flooding. Zone 1 has the lowest probability of flooding and Zone 3 the highest. NPPG advises that a risk-based sequential test should be applied to proposals with the aim of steering new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding. It classifies land uses according to their vulnerability to flooding; mineral workings (other than sand and gravel workings) are classed as ‘less vulnerable’ development which is appropriate development in zones 1, 2 and 3a. However, mineral working should not increase flood risk elsewhere and needs to be designed, worked and restored accordingly. It sets out that it may be possible to locate ancillary facilities such as processing plant and offices in areas at lowest flood risk. Sequential working and restoration can be designed to reduce flood risk by providing flood storage and attenuation.</p> | <p>PMAJ<br/>PMIN<br/>NMIN<br/>NMAJ</p> | <p>Site lies within flood zone 1- lowest probability of flooding<br/>Site lies within flood zone 2- medium probability of flooding<br/>Site lies within flood zone 3a- high probability of flooding<br/>Site lies within flood zone 3b- functional flood plain</p> | <p>The site lies in flood zone 1. Hard rock quarrying is classed as less vulnerable development which is appropriate in flood zones 1,2 and 3a. <b>PMAJ</b></p> |
| Water Environment – groundwater | 21            | <p>NPPG advises that groundwater is a consideration that should be taken into account. The EA designates Groundwater Source Protection Zones for important groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for drinking water supply. It is important that development within these Zones does not interrupt the flow or pollute the groundwater.</p>  | <p>PMIN<br/>NMIN</p>                   | <p>Site lies outside a groundwater source protection zone<br/>Site lies within a groundwater source protection zone</p>  | <p>The site lies outside a groundwater protection zone. <b>PMIN</b></p>   |

| Criteria   | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact                      | Indicators  | Assessment  |
|--|---------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Water Environment – aquifer protection             | 22            | NPPG advises that groundwater is a consideration that should be taken into account. Permeable rock deposits that store groundwater are known as aquifers. The EA designates two types of aquifer, superficial drift and bedrock deposits. Aquifers are further classified as Principal or Secondary. Principal aquifers usually provide a high level of water storage and may support water supply and/or river base flow on a strategic scale. Consequently they require the greatest protection from development that might be harmful to them. | PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ                 | Site lies on a Non Aquifer<br>Site lies on a Secondary Aquifer<br>Site lies on a Principal Aquifer  | The site lies within a secondary aquifer. <b>NMIN</b>   |
| Ecology – existing impacts from mineral extraction | 23            | NPPG advises that impacts on internationally, nationally or locally designated wildlife sites, protected habitats and species and ecological networks should be taken into account. Presence or absence of existing impacts from mineral extraction   | PMAJ<br><br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br><br>NMAJ | Over a wide area habitats have been fragmented by mineral extraction or habitats of limited quality have been created through mineral extraction but have potential to make a major contribution to biodiversity targets<br>Localised but moderate to high impacts<br>Only localised, limited impacts associated with mineral extraction on habitats within or adjacent to the site<br>None or insignificant impacts from mineral extraction on habitats within or adjacent to the site | The proposed site does not include any land designated for its nature conservation interest, although it does lie adjacent to an Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Site (Hall Dale Wood). The proposed site is essentially a new quarry rather than an extension to an existing one, although it does lie next to the disused Hall Dale Quarry and Parish Quarry. Nevertheless, the newly proposed quarry is significantly larger than either of those sites.<br>The two quarries immediately adjacent to the proposed site are both very small, historic and haven't been worked for a number of years and have therefore assimilated somewhat into the landscape. Neither impact upon habitats within the proposed site, although Hall Dale Quarry has clearly had some (historic, localised) impact upon habitats within Hall Dale Wood. In the wider area, whilst there are a reasonable number of quarries, these are again generally small, historic and/or long abandoned quarries which have no impact on the proposed site and negligible impact on the wider environment. <b>NMIN</b> |

| Criteria   | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact                                 | Indicators  | Assessment   |
|--|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| Ecology – UK, regional and local BAP priority species and habitats         | 24            | NPPG advises that impacts on internationally, nationally or locally designated wildlife sites, protected habitats and species and ecological networks should be taken into account. Presence or absence of existing priority habitats and species as identified by UK, regional and local BAPs | <p>PMAJ</p> <p>PMIN</p> <p>NMIN</p> <p>NMAJ</p> | <p>Extensive areas of degraded or biodiversity poor habitats that provide a context for possible allocation with an emphasis on habitat creation contributing to UK priority habitats</p> <p>Some areas of degraded or biodiversity poor habitats that provide a context for possible allocation with an emphasis on habitat restoration or creation contributing to UK and local priority habitats</p> <p>Some areas of positive ecological value including UK or local priority habitats or species which should be considered for protection/conservation</p> <p>Extensive areas of positive ecological value including UK priority habitats or species which should be considered for protection/conservation</p> | <p>The site appears to support small fields of improved grasslands divided by walls potentially with some vegetation/rough grassland around field margins. None of these habitats are exceptional, no part of the site is covered by ecological designations, no BAP habitats are known to occur nor are there records for notable species from this site. There are records for locally scarce or declining plant species from within 1km of the site, although these records would seem unlikely to be attributable to the site itself.</p> <p>The habitats within Hall Dale Wood are however notable in the local and the county context, and it is highly likely that bats and bat roosts are present within the wood and may forage and commute in the vicinity of the site. Whilst not especially notable, the habitats within the potential site are not incongruous or detrimental but are instead comparable to and complimentary to those found in the surrounding area. <b>PMIN</b></p> |
| Ecology – ecological coherence: Natural Areas/ Wildlife Corridors/linkages | 25            | NPPG advises that impacts on internationally, nationally or locally designated wildlife sites, protected habitats and species and ecological networks should be taken into account. Does the site have strong ecological coherence?  | <p>PMAJ</p> <p>PMIN</p> <p>NMIN</p> <p>NMAJ</p> | <p>The proposed site no longer accords with the established habitats over a wider area.</p> <p>The proposed site has few characteristics that accord with the established habitats over a wider area and its internal ecological coherence is poor OR coherence of the wider area is poor</p> <p>The proposed site generally accords with the established habitats over a wider area (or in part) but the condition of habitats is poor OR few features within the site but encompassed by landscapes which have ecological coherence</p> <p>The proposed site accords with the established habitats over a wider area and habitat pattern is strong</p>  | <p>The site appears to support small fields of improved grasslands divided by walls potentially with some vegetation/rough grassland around field margins. Whilst not especially notable, the habitats within the potential site are not incongruous or detrimental but are instead comparable to and complimentary to those found in the surrounding area. <b>NMIN</b></p>  |
| Ecology – Habitat Creation   | 26            | NPPG advises that the proposed restoration of the site should be taken into account. Does the site provide opportunities for habitat creation?   | <p>PMAJ</p> <p>PMIN</p> <p>NMIN</p> <p>NMAJ</p> | <p>The proposed site offers excellent opportunities to create or enhance UK priority habitats within the site and offers biodiversity benefit over a wider area e.g. by enhancing a habitat corridor.</p> <p>The site offers some opportunities to create or enhance UK or local priority habitats within its boundaries, making overall habitat gain, but may not make appropriate linkages to wider area.</p> <p>Existing habitats are intact and habitat creation would only provide limited biodiversity enhancement within the site or the</p>   | <p>The key ecological resources in this area are ancient woodlands, broadleaved woodlands, and to a lesser extent species rich grasslands. Obviously it is not possible to create ancient woodlands, but if soil resources are managed, site restoration should offer the opportunity to deliver new broadleaved woodlands and possibly grasslands. Inevitably, woodlands will take many decades to develop significant ecological interest, whilst isolated grasslands are of limited ecological value.</p> <p>Site restoration could therefore deliver a net gain for biodiversity through habitat creation, although this gain is likely</p>  |

| Criteria   | Criteria Ref. | Considerations  | Scale of impact              | Indicators   | Assessment   |
|--|---------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
|  |               |   |                              | wider area.<br>Existing habitats are intact and make a strong contribution to priority biodiversity targets for conservation and there is strong ecological coherence within the site; habitat creation would not enhance the site or the wider area.  | to be modest, slow to accrue and do little to enhance existing corridors, but could potentially strengthen and add to hall Dale Wood. <b>PMIN</b>  |
| Landscape-existing impacts from mineral extraction | 27            | NPPG advises that impacts on landscape character should be taken into account. A particular issue for hard rock quarries is the scope of the landscape character to accommodate mitigation and thereby reduce potential impacts. What is the character of the existing landscape including its scope to accommodate mitigation? | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | A landscape of complex character with many landscape characteristics that can be employed in the satisfactory mitigation/restoration of the site<br>A landscape of varied character with some landscape characteristics that can be employed in the satisfactory mitigation/restoration of the site<br>A simple landscape with few landscape characteristics that can be employed in the satisfactory mitigation/restoration of the site<br>An open and simple landscape with very few landscape characteristics that can be employed in the satisfactory mitigation/restoration of the site | The proposed site is located within the Dark Peak: Settled Valley Pastures LCT. This is typically a settled, pastoral landscape on the lower valley slopes, dissected by rivers and streams. The landscape is well wooded although at higher elevations it becomes more transitional with open moorland landscapes. The site is located in a more open plateau location surrounded by steep wooded slopes to the south and east, which makes the satisfactory mitigation of the site more difficult within the context of the established character of the wider landscape.<br><b>PMIN TO NMIN</b> |
| Landscape – Existing infrastructure                | 28            | NPPG advises that impacts on landscape character should be taken into account. Is there existing infrastructure that the site could be worked through and what is the impact in landscape terms from connecting to this?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | There is existing infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed site that can be readily and easily used<br>There is existing infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed site that could be connected to with slight adverse effects<br>There is existing infrastructure within the vicinity of the proposed site but there would be significant adverse impacts associated with connecting to it.<br>There is no existing infrastructure and this will need to be developed for the proposed site to be operated   | This is a greenfield site that will be accessed off Bent Lane, Darley Hillside; a narrow rural lane. A new reception area and compound is proposed for the site immediately adjacent to the road. There is the potential for secondary impacts associated with highway improvements that may be required to facilitate access and could therefore affect local landscape character and distinctiveness. <b>NMAJ</b>  |
| Landscape – Strength of Landscape Character        | 29            | NPPG advises that impacts on landscape character should be taken into account. Is the character of the landscape strong and visually coherent?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | The proposed site no longer accords with the established landscape character and the restoration of a 'new' landscape is required (Restore/create)<br>The proposed site has few characteristics that accord with the established landscape character and the condition is poor (Enhance)<br>The proposed site generally accords with the established landscape character (or in part) but the condition could be enhanced (Conserve and enhance)<br>The proposed site accords with the established landscape character and is in good condition (Conserve)                                   | The landscape of the site is somewhat transitional between the Settled Valley Pastures and Enclosed Moorland and is characterised by pastoral fields enclosed by dry stone walls. Boundaries are generally intact and this is reflected by the fact the site lies within an area of 'secondary' sensitivity with respect to the County Council's work to identify Areas of Multiple Environmental Sensitivity. This sensitivity relates to the historic and visual unity of this parcel of land. <b>NMIN/NMAJ</b>  |

| Criteria  | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact              | Indicators   | Assessment   |
|---|---------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| Landscape – visual impact                             | 30            | NPPG advises that impacts on landscape character should be taken into account. What would be the visual impact on the landscape of working the site?   | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | The site has few or no visual receptors and/or only small parts of the site will be visible<br>The site has few visual receptors but large parts (or more than one part) of the site will be visible<br>The site has some visual receptors and/or some parts of the site will be visible<br>The site has many visual receptors and/or large parts (or more than one part) of the site will be visible  | The site has many vantage points from where it will be viewed. It is clearly visible from Bent lane to the west of the site and the footpath that runs adjacent to this site boundary. Further afield it will be visible from Farley Hillside, residential dwellings along Hackney and further afield from various locations with the Peak District National Park. <b>NMAJ</b> |
| Landscape – impact on the Peak District National Park | 31            | NPPF requires great weight to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks. Many of the hard rock quarries within the Plan area lie in close proximity to the Peak District National Park (PDNP). Would working the site impact on the PDNP? | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | The site is not close to the PDNP boundary and no part of the site will be visible from it<br>The site is not close to the PDNP boundary although parts of the site may be visible from it<br>The site lies in close proximity to the PDNP boundary forming part of the wider setting and/or large parts of the site will be visible from it<br>The site abuts the PDNP boundary forming part of its immediate setting and/or large parts of the site will be clearly visible from it  | The site is located on the north-eastern slopes of the Derwent Valley as it extends through Darley Dale. The Peak District National Park boundary is located on the opposite side of the valley approximately 2 to 3km away although the land rises and may afford long distance views into the site from roads, footpaths and isolated dwellings. <b>PMIN</b>                 |
| Historic Environment – designated sites and settings  | 32            | NPPG advises that impacts on archaeology and heritage features should be taken into account. Would working the site impact on a designated site or its setting?  | PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ         | No perceivable impact on a designation and/or its setting<br>Impact on a Grade II designation, conservation area and/or its setting<br>Impact on a Grade I or II* designation, SAM and/or its setting  | <b>PMIN</b>  |
| Historic Environment – Archaeology                    | 33            | NPPG advises that impacts on archaeology and heritage features should be taken into account. What is the archaeological importance of the site?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | Little or known earthworks and/or known archaeology with low potential for buried archaeology<br>Occasional or localised earthworks (may not be visually evident) and/or known archaeology with limited potential for buried remains<br>Frequent, visible and interpretable earthworks and/or some known archaeology with significant potential for buried remains<br>Extensive, visible and interpretable earthworks and/or known archaeology with high potential for buried remains. | <b>PMAJ</b>  |
| Historic Environment – historic landscape             | 34            | NPPG advises that impacts on archaeology and heritage features should be taken into account. Is the historic character of the landscape strong?  | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | Historic field pattern largely gone<br>Remnant field patterns with significant boundary loss<br>Recognisable field patterns with some boundary loss<br>Evidence of multi-period landscape and/or intact field pattern (as indicated by 1st edition OS or earlier)  | Classed as regular pre 1880s enclosure and is part of a more extensive field pattern probably a result of parliamentary enclosure in the early to mid-19 <sup>th</sup> century. The pattern within the application areas seems intact. <b>NMAJ</b>   |
| Geological and  | 35            | NPPG advises that the impacts on nationally  | PMIN                         | No impact on a designated site   | There are no known features of geological or geomorphological  |

| Criteria  | Criteria Ref. | Considerations   | Scale of impact      | Indicators   | Assessment   |
|---|---------------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| Geomorphological features                       |               | protected geological and geomorphological sites and features need to be taken into account. What is the geological /geomorphological importance of the site?   | NMIN                 | Impact on a designated site  | value on the site. <b>PMIN</b>   |
| Best and most versatile agricultural land       | 36            | NPPG advises that the impacts on soil resources should be taken into account. What is the likelihood of the site containing bmv land?<br>At this stage we do not have detailed working and restoration proposals to assess how much bmv land will be conserved and in many cases we do not have information about the presence of bmv land. We have decided therefore to use DEFRA's predictive agricultural land classification map to indicate whether the site lies within an area where there is a high, moderate or low likelihood of bmv land being present. In principle areas of bmv land should be protected. | PMAJ<br>PMIN<br>NMIN | The site lies within an area where there is a low likelihood of bmv land (less than 20% of the land is likely to be bmv).<br>The site lies within an area where there is a moderate likelihood of bmv land (20-60% of the land is likely to be bmv).<br>The site lies within an area where there is a high likelihood of bmv land (more than 60% is likely to be bmv). | The site is classified as Grade 3 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map for the East Midlands. <b>PMAJ</b> |
| <b>Duty to Cooperate</b>                        |               |  |                      |  |  |
| Conformity with other local plans (allocations) | 37            | NPPF requires local planning authorities to cooperate on strategic cross border issues which includes ensuring that local plans are compatible<br>Is the site in conformity with other local plans?  | PMAJ<br>NMIN<br>NMAJ | The site is in conformity with other local plans<br>The site is not in conformity but the issue is likely to be resolvable<br>The site is not in conformity with other local plans and the issue is unlikely to be resolved  | <b>PMAJ</b>  |

## 5. Conclusions

The following commentary seeks to identify those factors that favour the allocation of the site and those that would constrain its allocation. A tabular summary of the assessment findings is set out below.

The following matters have been assessed as favouring the allocation of the site.

Key factors favouring the allocation of the site:

- The proposal would create employment opportunities and benefits to the local economy in a predominantly rural area where mining is a traditional important local employer
- There may be potential benefits from the restoration of the site
- There are no significant issues regarding cumulative impact of industry in the area.
- There are no issues regarding flooding in this area.
- The site is not high quality agricultural land.
- No part of the site is covered by ecological designations, no BAP habitats are known to occur nor are there records for notable species from this site.
- There is unlikely to be any significant archaeology on the site.

The following matters have been assessed as having a constraint to allocation:

- The proposed size of the quarry would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the area
- The need for the mineral from this site has not been fully justified.
- New infrastructure would have to be developed at the site.
- The proposed lorry route to and from the site along the narrow Bent Lane would be a major constraint to the working of this site. Any proposed widening to Bent Lane would harm its rural character and distinctiveness.
- The visual impact of the proposal. There are some sensitive visual receptors (footpaths and dwellings) to the south and the south west of the site that will be able to gain direct views of the quarry and there would also be more distant views of the quarry from settlements and properties across the Derwent Valley, including from the Peak District National Park and also from properties on the ridgeline to the east at Farley Hillside and Hackney.
- The landscape character is generally intact and is generally in good condition.
- The historic landscape pattern remains intact.
- Working the site will lead to the loss of an area that generally accords with the established landscape character.

Where potential negative impacts have been identified, the Mineral Planning Authority will carry out further detailed work, in consultation with appropriate bodies, to see if that impact could be mitigated or avoided to enable the site to go forward for allocation.

### Summary of Assessment

| Criteria  | PMAJ | PMIN | NMIN | NMAJ | Criteria   | PMAJ | PMIN | NMIN | NMAJ |
|---|------|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Economic Criteria</b>                                      |      |      |      |      | <b>Environmental Criteria</b>  |      |      |      |      |
| Need for mineral  |      |      |      | *    | Water Environment – Flood Risk   | *    |      |      |      |
| Quality/yield of mineral                                      |      | *    |      |      | Water Environment –groundwater   |      | *    |      |      |
| Use of mineral resources                                      |      | *    |      |      | Water Environment-aquifer protection                                       |      |      | *    |      |
| Location of Processing Plant                                  |      | *    |      |      | Ecology – existing impacts from mineral extraction                         |      |      | *    |      |
| Existing Infrastructure                                       |      |      | *    |      | Ecology – UK, regional and local BAP priority species and habitats         |      | *    |      |      |
| Sterilisation of Resources                                    |      |      | *    |      | Ecology – ecological coherence: Natural Areas/ Wildlife Corridors/linkages |      |      | *    |      |
| Employment  | *    |      |      |      | Ecology – Habitat Creation   |      | *    |      |      |
| <b>Social Criteria</b>  |      |      |      |      | Landscape- existing impacts from mineral extraction                        |      | *    | *    |      |
| Duration of mineral extraction                                |      |      | *    |      | Landscape – Existing infrastructure  |      |      |      | *    |
| Visual Intrusion  |      |      |      | *    | Landscape – Strength of Landscape Character                                |      |      | *    | *    |
| Noise   |      |      | *    |      | Landscape/– visual impact  |      |      |      | *    |
| Nuisance Dust   |      | *    |      |      | Landscape – impact on the Peak District National Park                      |      | *    |      |      |
| Air Quality/ Human Health                                     |      | *    |      |      | Historic Environment –designated sites and settings                        |      | *    |      |      |
| Blasting /Vibration   |      | *    |      |      | Historic Environment – Archaeology   | *    |      |      |      |
| Transport – Local Amenity                                     |      |      | *    |      | Historic Environment –historic landscape                                   |      |      |      | *    |
| Transport - Safe and effective access to and from the site    |      |      | *    |      | Geological and Geomorphological features                                   |      | *    |      |      |
| Transport – Export route (vehicular)                          |      |      |      | *    | Best and most versatile agricultural land                                  | *    |      |      |      |
| Transport - Capacity for sustainable transport options        |      |      | *    |      | <b>Duty to Cooperate</b>   |      |      |      |      |
| Benefits from the working, restoration and proposed after-use |      | *    |      |      | Conformity with other local plans (allocations)                            | *    |      |      |      |
| Cumulative impact   |      | *    |      |      |  |      |      |      |      |