

**Additional Representations made by
Nottingham City Council in response
to the Inspector's Supplementary
Questions as part of the Examination
in to the Nottinghamshire Mineral
Local Plan**



Nottingham
City Council

June 2020

Overview

Nottingham City Council responded to the Inspector's original Matters, Issues and Questions, issued on 27 February 2020, specifically to questions related to Matter 3: Minerals Provision Policies.

Since then, the Inspector has issued a further set of Supplementary Questions on 6 May 2020, which relate to each of the 5 original Matters.

The Inspector has instructed that additional responses will only be accepted from those identified as participants for the individual matters. However, Nottingham City Council has additional points that it wishes to make in relation to Matters 1, 2 and 5 as these relate to comments made to Matter 3 or the original submission.

Matter 3 – Minerals Provision Policies

Inspector's Supplementary Questions		Nottingham City Council's response
No.	Question	
31	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assesses the Mill Hill, Barton-in-Fabis allocation as having a long-term negative effect on biodiversity. Please provide further explanation as to how allocation of the site is justified in this respect, particularly having regard to the need to provide net gains in biodiversity in paragraph 170 (d) of the Framework.	The SA concludes that there would be a negative impact in both the short and long term of mineral extraction at the Mill Hill site. The City Council remains unconvinced that the Mill Hill allocation will result in net biodiversity gain and therefore not compliant with national policy.
32	The SA assesses the effects of development at Mill Hill on heritage assets as positive in the long-term, but the effect on the landscape as very negative. Would negative landscape effects also negatively affect the settings of heritage assets in the long-term?	The landscape forms an essential part of the wider historic setting of the heritage assets so yes, of course the negative impact on the landscape would also equate to a negative impact on the setting of heritage assets. Historically the fields to the south side of the Trent in this location have provided an agrarian landscape setting for the wooded escarpment of Clifton Grove (RPG) and Clifton Hall beyond. The long-term impact of converting the fields to gravel pits, however well mitigated, will be negative and permanent. The SA concludes that "... in the long-term the impact on the settings of heritage assets could be positive or negative depending on the details of restoration ..." but for the reasons given above it is the City Council's view that the impact could only ever be negative.
33	What is the justification for the positive score for effect on heritage assets in the SA?	The City Council cannot see how the effect on heritage assets could be considered anything other than harmful and therefore negative – see answer to question 32.
34	The Site Allocation Development Brief states that there would be permanent impact on the setting of the Clifton Hall Registered Park and Garden and potential impacts on other designated heritage assets in Barton-in-Fabis, Attenborough and Clifton. What would be the nature of such impacts and would development also affect the	See above comments on question 32. The impact will be on the setting of the assets and their visual and historic relationship with the agrarian landscape in which they are located.

Inspector's Supplementary Questions		Nottingham City Council's response
No.	Question	
	setting of the listed Clifton Hall and/or any other heritage asset(s)?	
35	Would these impacts be harmful to the settings of the heritage assets and would any such harm be less than substantial?	The level of harm would be classed as 'less than substantial' to use the NPPF's terminology as it impacts on setting rather than having a direct impact on the physical fabric of the assets affected.
36	Has any balancing exercise been carried out to weigh any less than substantial harm against public benefits?	The City Council has not seen convincing evidence to show that the public benefit of the development sufficiently outweighs the less than substantial harm the development will cause to the heritage assets.
37	What, if any, mitigation measures could be used to reduce any harmful impact on heritage assets?	The City Council cannot foresee any mitigation that would reduce the harmful impacts on heritage impacts. The nature of open cast gravel extraction is to have a permanent impact on the agrarian character of the landscape. The planting of trees and shrubs or restoring land to open water is not sufficient as mitigation as it does not replicate the open nature of the existing fields and would detract from the established visual contrast between the fields and the heavily wooded RPG behind.
38	What effects would be likely on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, both during operation and in the long term?	In the short term, the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be substantial given the industrial nature of the development including the required structures, movement of vehicles and the general activity on the site. Longer term through restoration the impact could be addressed but not to the same degree.
39	Could any mitigation measures be used to reduce any impact on the Green Belt?	Given the nature of the operation, and the need to remove material, difficult to see what mitigation could be put in place to sufficiently minimise this impact.
40	Should the reference in paragraph 4.41 to the Mill Hill site being expected to be operational in approximately 2019 be deleted or amended?	Nothing else to add here, the City Council made reference to this in our initial response.