**Barton meetings**

* **Site walkover/visit with planning agent (Greenfield) 06/11/19.**

NCC attendees- Team Manager Development Management, Principal Planning Officer, Historic Buildings Leader and Natural Environment Manager.

Indicative plans were later tabled showing suggestions for amendments to the proposed extraction area.

* **Further site walkover 20/11/19** with NCC/Via landscape consultant
* **Meeting 18/12/19** attended by Team Manager Development Management, Principal Planning Officer, Natural England and NCC Natural Environment Manager and planning agent (Greenfield).

Greenfield indicated that around 32% of the potential extraction area is not going to be worked.  Around 300,000 tonnes would be removed from extraction. The Barton Drain would be now be left in place.

Discussion then on water quality in Holme Pit SSSI. Greenfield stated that the ES states that it would be beneficial if the water quality is appropriate.  Need to note that site would not be continually dewatered due to campaign basis of extraction. Groundwater cone of influence is around 45 metres so dewatering would not impact on Holme Pit. Barton drain would continue. Also Holme pit is fed by groundwater.

Greenfield plans indicate that flooding issues come from water entering the area beyond Beeston Weir.  Flooding on the application site itself is derived from surface water, not from the river bank overflowing. River flooding is not an impact in terms of developing the site.

Impact of the stockpile/siltation on Holme Pit – Greenfield stated that silts and clays make up around 6% of mineral being dug. So not proposed to remove the stockpile as the silt percentage is low, particularly compared to the silt being washed over the site by the river breaking its banks. Greenfield asked if NE is insisting on groundwater being discharged into the drains feeding Holme Pit.  Greenfield not proposing to discharge into the drains per se but could do so if NE made a request.  However, the quality would be the same in terms of phosphorous levels and would be subject to settlement to remove silts etc. Possible opportunity to put a reedbed somewhere around Barton Drain to help water quality.

Noise impact on bird assemblage at Attenborough – apply 55dB limit at the SSSI boundary during the bird breeding season and 59dB outside.

Biodiversity enhancement - no indication in the NPPF as to when net gain is actually provided.  Greenfield considers that it is going to be difficult if not impossible to demonstrate net gain in the initial stages of the development.

NCC - opportunities to manage the LWSs/create new habitat. Not suggesting that it is done on a phased basis.

Ancient Woodland - need for a bird survey (see Reg 25 letter).  Some historic records of long eared owl.  Accepted that breeding birds are going to be in the wood so might as well accept that it is the case and work on the required mitigation.

* **Additional site visit on 13/01/2020** with NCC Natural Environment Manager
* **Meeting 23/01/2020** to discuss archaeology requirements. Attendees: NCC Senior Practitioner -archaeology, Team Manager Development Management, Principal Planning Officer. Nottingham City Archaeologist. Oxford Archaeology and Greenfield (for applicant).

Greenfield trying to ensure what is submitted next is sufficient. OxArch have reviewed previous work, including that undertaken by CgMs, the previous consultants working for the applicant. Geophys and targeted evaluation.  Desk Based Assessment provided but NottsCC sought a revision to this given the A453 etc and the low evaluation given to this area.

OxArch propose to do mitigation strategy and further evaluation of the city land. Strip map sample of Brandshill with Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) modified as the site is developed.

Greenfield believe plant site was evaluated as part of the A453.  However NottsCC advised that the previous work under-interpreted the Brandshill area and the A453/NET finds.

Approaches to the top soils strip for the plant site discussed. NottsCC suggests geophys survey of the Brandshill to de-risk the area. Possible hill fort and the slope has lynchets.  Recommends strip, map and record for this area as part of the WSI.  Geophys is not really worthwhile on the slope.

OxArch agrees to undertake geophys and then discuss the results and agree further works. Geophys could help reduce the areas for trenching with cost savings. Envisages a period post determination and prior to commencement when targeted trenches etc can be done.

Greenfield advise the plant area is deliberately larger than likely required so scope to be flexible if interest is found. Raises difficulty with area of scrub. NottsCC suggests strip, map and record for that area.

Greenfield feels that a scheme of mitigation can be put together for the extraction area.  Ongoing works would inform phase 5 in the City.

NCC want geophys of city area done now. Greenfield concerned about timescales. But all agreed to.

Archaeologists to liaise to confirm scope of submission.

* **Meeting 28/01/2020** to discuss noise information requirements. Attendees: NCC/Via Noise consultant; Team Manager Development Management, Principal Planning Officer. Vibrock and Greenfield (for applicant).

Greenfield updates Via Noise on changes to the scheme, mainly ecological.  Also highlighted which building at Burrows Farm is the occupied farmhouse and which are barns etc.

Point 1 of Reg 25 request. Baseline monitoring position map- done.

Point 2 of Reg 25 request. Screening /barrier correction for receptors.

Via asked about baselines from Burrows Farm.  Greenfield confirmed that although there has been access/engagement issues baseline monitoring has been undertaken.

Vibrock consider that a combination of the bund and the farm buildings would provide screening.  Soft ground correction of 5dB at around 300 metres.  Only count screening or soft ground but not both.

There is a contour which appears to protect Burrows Farm from the plant site.  Via wants clarification on this.  Need to create a cross-section to confirm in detail.

Trentside Chalet - Phase 5 would be closest.

Dumper would be working around 1.8-2.2 metres below existing ground levels to reflect the depth of the overburden.

Chestnut Lane - three metre floodbank already in place.

Two caravans on the river bank near Barton.  Question on their status.  Via considers to be a sensitive receptor.  Greenfield proposes a noise limit.  Not in the Reg 25 but to be confirmed whether it needs to be included or not.

Point 3 of Reg 25 request. Methodology of working discussed. Plant complement appears to be low but this reflects the campaign basis which would mean plant would not be moving mineral all the time and so would be able to undertake restoration works at other times.

Point 4 of Reg 25 request -screening/mitigation to woodland. Options. Greenfield considers that stand-off and vegetation provides the necessary mitigation/screening.  What mitigation is required.  Is it bird breeding season related only or all year round.  If bird breeding season related, can distances be set which would not be worked.  The site working could be measured during the initial phases to dictate how stand-offs could be set.

Point 5 of Reg 25 request Attenborough noise mitigation. Question on screening and source-receiver height.

Depth of overburden should provide sufficient justification.

Point 6 of Reg 25 request - Question on conveyor system cumulative noise and noise mitigation for bridleway crossing.

The hopper has been moved further from the bridleway and extraction would also be further away.  Is there a proactive way of managing the crossing of the bridleway to avoid any conflict.  Biggest issue would be during construction and there would need to be a temporary diversion

* **Meeting 16/03/2020** to discuss ecology information requirements. Attendees NWT, Greenfield and FPCR (for applicant) NCC attendees Natural Environment Manager, Team Manager Development Management, Principal Planning Officer.

EIA and Reg 25 submission. Greenfield envisages the Reg 25 being accompanied by a separate addendum looking at each section of the ES which examines whether there have been any knock-on impacts.  Not looking to resubmit the whole EIA.

Biodiversity net gain metrics. FPCR has looked at the previous calculator and considers that there would be a net gain but not as much as previous (around 60).  This is based on the scheme as previously calculated, not as now proposed.  Looked at 10-15 year timelines, not 5 years.

Greenfield queries whether it is necessary to calculate the revised scheme due to the work involved.  NCC suggests that they do it for completeness. Question from Greenfield as to whether the Environment Act is going to set the net gain requirement at 20%.

NCC- it would work in the applicant's favour to do it. Two year transition for the Environment Act. Need to see the inputs that have been made and the outputs for habitat creation.

Agreed that metrics will be undertaken on the amended plans and presented (with full/open data) as part of the Reg 25.

Indirect noise impacts to Attenborough nature reserve/SSSI and bird species possibly using Brandshill woods. To be informed by noise assessment work. Greenfield considers that a condition on noise and monitoring would be sufficient. May be safer to assume species are present and to devise mitigation buffers and seasonal mitigation as needed.

Otters -are there incomplete surveys.  Do we need surveys in advance of each phase.  NCC - we need to be satisfied by the level of survey undertaken.  Need to understand the potential impacts of them using the ditches.  Need to have regard to the Habitats Regulations.  NWT suggests the use of trail cameras.  FPCR not clear as to what we want.  NCC wants to be satisfied that the work done on otters is sufficiently robust.  If matters raise themselves during development, there is legislation to protect them.  NCC - what measures can be provided.  Might need to rephase the site or take other measures.  NCC - are the indirect impacts of quarrying going to impact significantly on otters.  Could do some more survey work to ascertain whether they are using the ditch, or assume that they are without survey and propose mitigation such as stand-offs, restricting some workings etc.  Greenfield - would otter be impacted by flooding.  Middle drain usually dry in the summer.  Would it be used by otter.  NWT - yes it might do.  NCC - preferred approach is to assume that otters use the ditch and provide a mitigation strategy on that basis which includes further survey.

Noise on Brandshill - fixed plant at Two Oaks, excavator and dump trucks there.  If confident that there won't be an impact, why can't Greenfield demonstrate that through the provision of noise contour plans.  Can noise contour plans work well with mobile plant as well as fixed plant.  NCC - constraints of surveys, precautionary approach including surveys for raven and cetis warbler.  Long Eared Owl to also consider.  Have they been seen in the area.  FPCR considers the habitat to not be appropriate.  Greenfield spoke with local bird watchers and they have not seen any.

Nesting barn owls - the applicant needs to contact the Rushcliffe Barn Owl Project.  Need to match the results with noise surveys and consider noise impacts.  Opportunities to relocate or provide additional boxes in retained LWS.

Roosting bats - details submitted in the second Reg 25 submission.  Can't get in Brandshill Wood, therefore precautionary approach.

Barn owl hunting habitat - submitted in second Reg 25 submission.  NCC concerned about accuracies on this, such as the description of some of the habitats that were being lost phase by phase (arable instead of SI grassland).  Also, scheme has changed so worth looking at it again.

Necklace Ground Beetle - is area D big enough and should it also include some of the higher ground.  Ridge and Furrow area is higher ground but does need enhancing.  We need assurances that a translocated population has survived a couple of years before we lose Area D, otherwise a larger area of Area D would need to be retained.  Greenfield thinks that likely to be Year 7 before working in Area D.  Could even leave Area D to be worked at the end.  Ridge and Furrow area would need to be surveyed to see if they are actually in there in the first place.  Focussed survey work required.  If they are already in other areas such as the Ridge and Furrow, do we need to translocate.  However, we are going to lose habitat.  Mitigation strategy to be provided.  Is this as part of the Reg 25 or pre-commencement.

Water voles - could also be picked up with trail cameras.  No direct loss of habitat now that ditches are being retained.  Stand-off distances to be provided as a precautionary approach.  Surveys prior to all phases.

Possible Great Crested Newts - has the pond been identified in the applications for the housing or the A453.  Possible need to survey.

Harvest Mouse and Grass Snake - NCC considers they have been adequately covered already and with retained habitat, all is OK.  Surveys prior to each phase if the habitat is deemed appropriate in each phase.  Precautionary statement to be provided for each species.