

**Nottingham County Council Minerals Plan;**  
**Issues and Options Consultation**  
**(20<sup>th</sup> November 2017 to 14<sup>th</sup> January 2018)**



**Call For Sites**

**Site Promotion supporting information:**  
***Shelford West***

**January 2018**

## **Contents**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Site Context**
- 3. Site Details and proposals questionnaire**
- 4. Appendices:**
  - i. Site Location Plan and overview Layout Plan**
  - ii. Restoration Concept Plan**
  - iii. Phasing concept plans**
  - iv. Site Access design**
  - v. Borehole Logs**
  - vi. EIA scoping Request**
  - vii. EIA scoping opinion**
  - viii. Colwick Wharf Concept Design**

## **Introduction**

In response to the call for minerals sites issued by Nottinghamshire County Council as part of the Minerals Plan Issues and Options Consultation (November 2017), Brett Group/ Brett Aggregates Ltd (BAL) wish to put forward the site of a new quarry known as Shelford West (as depicted on the site location/ layout drawing in appendix 1).

The land represents a significant sand and gravel resource, the future development of which will ensure that Nottinghamshire, in particular the south of the County including the City of Nottingham, will be able to meet an adequate supply of aggregates throughout the plan period whilst minimizing the amount of mineral miles travelled on the County's road network by HGVs delivering aggregate. It will also provide for the delivery of aggregate using the River Trent to bring aggregate into the established industrial area of the City for use in the production of concrete. This approach accords with National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF) in respect of providing a steady and adequate supply of mineral and sustainable development objectives.

The Shelford West site was previously promoted, and allocated, within the submission draft Nottinghamshire Minerals Plan which was due to go for 'Examination in Public' in June 2017. Following withdrawal of the Submission Draft of the Minerals Local Plan in May 2017, Nottinghamshire County Council have recently published an Issues and Options document in respect of a revised MLP and requested minerals developers come forward once again with proposed minerals sites. The Shelford Site is again put forward in response to this new call for minerals sites.

Primary contact with the Brett Group/ BAL in regard to this consultation/ the call for sites is: Chris Hemmingsley, Area Planning Manager, Lands & Planning Department, Brett Group, Robert Brett House, Ashford Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT4 7PP, Tel: 01227 829061, Mob: 07484 088794, E-mail:chris.hemmingsley@brett.co.uk.

## **Site Context**

The Shelford West site is located in the Borough of Rushcliffe and contains approximately 6.5 million tonnes of mineral have been identified through borehole surveys (see appendix 5). The site will be worked in phases (see appendix 3) with mineral either being processed on site and exported by barge along the River Trent to Colwick Wharf (see appendix 8 for the Colwick wharf proposed layout) or will be transported by conveyor to a processing plant and storage area alongside the A6097 from where it will be transported by road.

It is expected that 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) will be processed and exported from the site with 180,000 tpa leaving by barge and 320,000 tpa by road. It is intended that the mineral from the Shelford West site will be used to continue to feed into the established markets in Nottingham and the south of the County.

The Shelford West site lies in the expansive largely flat valley of the River Trent. It principally comprises intensively farmed agricultural land with large fields predominating. Alongside the River Trent an existing flood defence will be left as part of an undisturbed margin adjoining the river.

To the south of the site lies the village of Shelford. Between the village and the proposed extraction area are further flood defences and a belt of trees. It is proposed that restoration will mainly be to water based nature conservation with overburden from the site used to create wetland areas (see appendix 2).

Access to the site will be from the A6097 (see appendix 4) with the extraction area linked to the main plant site (as shown on the appended drawings) by conveyor.

It is proposed that extraction would take place at a rate of approximately 500,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) meaning that the life of the site would span approximately 14 years allowing for a 6 month set up period and a further year for final restoration to take place.

In 2015 BAL submitted an EIA screening and scoping request to Nottinghamshire County Council, a copy of this can be found in Appendix 6, with the County Councils Scoping Opinion attached in Appendix 7. Both documents providing further detail and clarity on the proposed development at Shelford.

## Site details and proposals questionnaire responses

### 1. Location

- 1.1. Proposed boundary of the site: *See attached drawing (Appendix 1)*
- 1.2. Extent of excavations: *See attached drawing (Appendix 1)*
- 1.3. Proposed access to the site, including a map of key routes from the site to the nearest major roads: *See attached drawings (Appendix 1 & 4)*
- 1.4. Possible locations of processing plant: *See attached drawing (Appendix 1)*
- 1.5. Phasing: *See attached drawings (Appendix 3)*
- 1.6. An OS map of the site: *See attached drawing. (Appendix 1)*
- 1.7. Estimated number of HGV movements per day/month/year: *It is proposed that the site will produce up to 500,000 tpa and that 180,000tpa will be transported by barge to Colwick Wharf where it will be used in the manufacture of concrete. This leaves 320,000tpa to leave the site by road. The predicted HGV movements are as follows:-*

	HGV movements based on 30t
Per year	10,667
Per month (12)	889
Per day (274)	39

### 2. Reserve data(with supporting evidence)

- 2.1. Quality and quantity of recoverable reserves: *6.5MT of sand and gravel*
- 2.2. Estimated output per annum: *500,000 T*
- 2.3. Estimated lifespan of thee mineral working (years): *14 years*
- 2.4. When will the site be ready to be worked? *2019/2020*

### 3. Role of site/markets

- 3.1. Is the site a new Greenfield site or an extension: *This is a new site.*
- 3.2. If a Greenfield site, is it replacing an existing mineral working within or outside the county: *In effect, Shelford would replace the closed quarries at Hoveringham, Holme Pierrepont and Attenborough.*
- 3.3. What is your planned market area? *Nottingham city and the south of the county.*
- 3.4. Is the location of the site optimum in terms of serving the market? *Yes.*

### 4. Availability of Mineral

- 4.1. Do you have the legal rights to work all of the mineral including access to the public highway or any other transport route? *Yes.*

## 5. Landowner consent

- 5.1. Who is the legal owner of the site? *The Crown Estate.*
- 5.2. Is the legal owner of the site the mineral operator? *No.*
- 5.3. Has the legal owner made a formal agreement with any mineral operator for mineral exploration and/or extraction? *Yes.*

## 6. Agricultural land quality

- 6.1. Agricultural land classification found within the site: *Grade 3 agricultural land.*

## 7. Sensitive receptors

- 7.1. Is the site located within 250m of any sensitive receptors? (schools, residential dwellings, workplaces healthcare facilities): *No.*

## 8. Reclamation

- 8.1. Proposed reclamation schemes –what opportunities for environmental benefits do you see arising from the scheme? *The site is currently in large scale largely arable cultivation. Ecological surveys commissioned by BAL have shown that the current use is of low ecological value. In accordance with the previous draft MLP Shelford allocation BAL have held a number of meetings with key stakeholders including NWT, RSPB, EA and the County's ecologist in order to explore how the highest level of ecological restoration can be achieved. This has involved BAL commissioning flood modelling work to determine how some of the options, in particular the removal of the secondary flood defence adjacent to the River Trent could be achieved without causing increased flood risk elsewhere, particularly further downstream of the site. The attached concept restoration proposal drawing (appendix 2) show the result of that work together with advice from the various stakeholders. It should be noted that the restoration proposed seeks to balance a high level of ecological restoration with providing access to the local community through footpath access alongside the river in an area where there is currently no public access. The opportunity to provide this important missing link alongside the river will be taken and the existing lane across working area will be retained.*

*The proposals are now at a stage that had the draft MLP not been withdrawn BAL would be looking to seek a wider consultation including the general public, Parish Council and other stakeholders.*

- 8.2. Does the reclamation of the site depend on importing fill? If so, please indicate types of waste, main sources and timescales: *The site restoration is not dependant on importing fill.*

**Appendix i.**

**Site Location and overview Layout Plan**

**Appendix ii.**

**Restoration concept plan**

**Appendix iii.**

**Phasing concept plans**

**Appendix iv.**

**Site Access design**

**Appendix v.**  
**Borehole Logs**



**Appendix vi.**

**EIA scoping Request**

**Appendix vii.**

**EIA scoping opinion**

**Appendix viii.**

**Colwick Wharf Concept Design**