

Colin Godfrey
Northumberland National Park
Eastburn South Park
Hexham
Northumberland
NE46 1BS

Our ref: NA/2022/115992/01-L01
Your ref: 22NP0066

Date: 09 September 2022

Dear Colin

VARIATION TO PLANNING PERMISSION 14NP0057 FOR A LATERAL EXTENSION TO QUARRY AND TIME EXTENSION TO OPERATIONAL LIFE BEYOND ITS CURRENT PERMITTED END DATE OF 2029 EXTENDING TO 2054.

HARDEN QUARRY, BIDDLESTONE, NETHERTON, ROTHBURY, NORTHUMBERLAND, NE65 7DX.

Thank you for referring the above application which we received on 23 July 2022.

Environment Agency Position

We have **NO OBJECTIONS** to the proposed development as submitted. However, we have the following comments/advice to offer:

Ground Water – Advice to Applicant/LPA

The information provided within chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement, which relates to water resources is sufficient to describe the hydrogeological impacts of the proposed quarry extension.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Yours sincerely

Linda Cruse
Planning Advisor

[Redacted signature block]

Mr Colin Godfrey
Northumberland National Park Authority
Eastburn
South Park
Hexham
Northumberland
NE46 1BS

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: P01537573

12 September 2022

Dear Mr Godfrey

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**HARDEN QUARRY, BIDDLESTONE, NETHERTON, ROTHBURY,
NORTHUMBERLAND, NE65 7DX
Application No. 22NP0066**

Thank you for your letter of 23 August 2022 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Summary

The proposal will ensure the preservation of the scheduled monument on Bleakmoor Hill, albeit with the subsequent loss of non-designated heritage features in the immediate landscape. The sense of openness out from the monument will be harmed by the close proximity of the quarry. The proposed archaeological mitigation, which could be conditioned should the application be approved, would provide some off-setting of the harm to the setting and significance of the monument.

We advise that the application is determined in line with NPPF policies. In particular, the LPA will need to make the necessary judgement required in para. 202 of weighing up the harm versus the public benefits of permitting the extension.

**Historic England Advice
Significance**

The enclosure at Bleakmoor Hill represents a rare example of an Iron Age hilltop enclosure which did not develop into a hillfort. Although it has suffered from soil denudation over time, it still contains archaeological evidence which can tell us a great deal more about the site, its use, and contribute to wider discussions about this region and this period more generally. Given this, and that the National Heritage List for England records that there are only 11 palisaded hilltop enclosures which are

scheduled in England, we believe that the site remains one of national significance.

The site is protected as a scheduled monument known as "Palisaded settlement on Bleakmoor Hill, 700m north west of Biddlestone Townfoot farm" (NHLE asset number: 1008562)

Impact

The cultural heritage of the proposal area has been comprehensively assessed as well as the impact of the proposal on it. The results support the application and have been used to devise proposed mitigation of the impacts. Historic England, along with the Northumberland National Park Authority, were consulted prior to the application.

The proposed variation is for a lateral extension of c. 45m to the quarry edge, as well as a time extension to its operational life.

The new quarry edge is proposed to be marked by a 1m high bund covered in native vegetation and a fence. It will come within c.10m of the boundary of the scheduled monument and in doing so will remove some non-designated heritage assets in its vicinity including a burial cairn, some orthostats, parts of a linear boundary, and some small clearance cairns.

There will be no direct impact to the scheduled monument, but there will be impact to its setting. The monument is part of a landscape which survived several millenia, although it has been eroded as a consequence. The landscape was clearly in use during multiple periods of time from the Mesolithic through to the Post Medieval. Much of what remains visible today primarily dates to the Late Neolithic / Early Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, and with later Post Medieval agricultural practices evident.

The proposed loss of features within the monument's setting is regrettable, however the proposed mitigation strategy, should the variation be granted with suitable conditions, may be seen to off-set that impact by providing data to enhance knowledge and understanding. It is proposed to carry out archaeological works including but not limited to:

- excavation of affected assets
- geo-chemical soil analysis
- high resolution imagery
- pollen coring and analysis of a waterlogged feature outside of the red-line boundary
- annual monitoring of the monument and its vicinity

Whilst the quarry extension ensures that the monument is retained, the proposed 1m high bund with fencing and native planting within 10m of the boundary will have an

impact on views out from the monument. The sense of openness that one still has today, despite the active quarry below, will be lost.

Policy

This application needs to be judged against Government policy on the importance of conserving heritage for the benefit of current and future generations, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021). In particular, the following policies are relevant:

- **Paragraph 189** is clear that all heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
- **Para. 194** requires that developers describe the significance of any heritage assets which may be affected, including any contribution made by their setting. In addition, where a proposed development will or may impact on potential archaeological assets, the local planning authority should require a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
- **Para. 199** requires that when there is an impact from a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- **Para. 200** requires that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
- **Para. 202** requires that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.

Some of the mitigation proposed is on the scheduled monument and would therefore also need to have Consent from the Secretary of State for DCMS.

Position

It is Historic England's position that the proposal will cause harm to the setting of the scheduled monument - both visually and through the loss of associated features in the immediate landscape. If conditioned and carried out accordingly, the proposed archaeological mitigation would off-set some of the harm caused.

We believe that the proposal will amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the scheduled monument. We advise that the LPA should make the necessary weighing up of harm versus public benefits that is required when making a determination. Some of the proposed mitigation works may require consent from the Secretary of State at DCMS if the development proposal is approved.

Recommendation

Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 194, 199 and 200. In addition, it should be assessed to determine if it meets the requirements of para. 202.

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the application. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us. Please advise us of the decision in due course.

Yours sincerely

Lee McFarlane

Lee McFarlane

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: [REDACTED]

cc: Chris Jones, NNPA Archaeological Advisor

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Subject: 22NP0066 Consultation Response
Date: 21 September 2022 12:38:50
Attachments: [REDACTED]
Importance: High

Caution: This email originated from outside NNPA. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir or Madam,

Our ref: 405167

Your ref: 22NP0066

Planning consultation: Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029 extending to 2054

Location: Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX

Thank you for your consultation.

Natural England currently has no comment to make on the Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date.

Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us any further consultations regarding this development, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.

Yours sincerely,

Dominic Rogers
Consultations Team
Natural England
Hornbeam House, Electra Way
Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Natural England offers the following additional advice:

Landscape

Paragraph 174 of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes through the planning system. This application may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes, including any local landscape designations. You may want to consider whether any local landscape features or characteristics (such as ponds, woodland, or dry-stone walls) could be incorporated into the development to respond to and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness, in line with any local landscape character assessments. Where the impacts of development are likely to be significant, a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with the proposal to inform decision making. We refer you to the [Landscape Institute](#) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for further guidance.

Best and most versatile agricultural land and soils

Local planning authorities are responsible for ensuring that they have sufficient detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) information to apply NPPF policies (Paragraphs 174 and 175). This is the case regardless of whether the proposed development is sufficiently large to consult Natural England. Further information is contained in [GOV.UK guidance](#) Agricultural Land Classification information is available on the [Magic](#) website on the [Data.Gov.uk](#) website. If you consider the proposal has significant implications for further loss of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, we would be pleased to discuss the matter further.

Guidance on soil protection is available in the Defra [Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites](#), and we recommend its use in the design and construction of development, including any planning conditions. For mineral working and landfilling separate guidance on soil protection for site restoration and aftercare is available on [Gov.uk](#) website. Detailed guidance on soil handling for mineral sites is contained in the Institute of Quarrying [Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings](#).

Should the development proceed, we advise that the developer uses an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of soils on site.

Protected Species

Natural England has produced [standing advice](#)¹ to help planning authorities understand the impact of particular developments on protected species. We advise you to refer to this advice. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on protected species where they form part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest or in exceptional circumstances.

Local sites and priority habitats and species

You should consider the impacts of the proposed development on any local wildlife or geodiversity sites, in line with paragraphs 175 and 179 of the NPPF and any relevant development plan policy. There may also be opportunities to enhance local sites and improve their connectivity. Natural England does not hold locally specific information on local sites and recommends further information is obtained from appropriate bodies such as the local records centre, wildlife trust, geoconservation groups or recording societies.

Priority habitats and Species are of particular importance for nature conservation and included in the England Biodiversity List published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Most priority habitats will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. List of priority habitats and species can be found [here](#)². Natural England does not routinely hold species data, such data should be collected when impacts on priority habitats or species are considered likely. Consideration should also be given to the potential environmental value of brownfield sites, often found in urban areas and former industrial land, further information including links to the open mosaic habitats inventory can be found [here](#).

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals>

² <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx>

Ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees

You should consider any impacts on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in line with paragraph 180 of the NPPF. Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland [Inventory](#) which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced [standing advice](#) for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees. It should be taken into account by planning authorities when determining relevant planning applications. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees where they form part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest or in exceptional circumstances.

Environmental gains

Development should provide net gains for biodiversity in line with the NPPF paragraphs 174(d), 179 and 180. Development also provides opportunities to secure wider environmental gains, as outlined in the NPPF (paragraphs 8, 73, 104, 120, 174, 175 and 180). We advise you to follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in paragraph 180 of the NPPF and firstly consider what existing environmental features on and around the site can be retained or enhanced or what new features could be incorporated into the development proposal. Where onsite measures are not possible, you should consider off site measures. Opportunities for enhancement might include:

- Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.
- Restoring a neglected hedgerow.
- Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.
- Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.
- Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.
- Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.
- Designing lighting to encourage wildlife.
- Adding a green roof to new buildings.

Natural England's [Biodiversity Metric 3.1](#) may be used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial and intertidal habitats and can be used to inform any development project. For small development sites the [Small Sites Metric](#) may be used. This is a simplified version of [Biodiversity Metric 3.1](#) and is designed for use where certain criteria are met. It is available as a beta test version.

You could also consider how the proposed development can contribute to the wider environment and help implement elements of any Landscape, Green Infrastructure or Biodiversity Strategy in place in your area. For example:

- Links to existing greenspace and/or opportunities to enhance and improve access.
- Identifying opportunities for new greenspace and managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips)
- Planting additional street trees.
- Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network or using the opportunity of new development to extend the network to create missing links.
- Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore).

Natural England's [Environmental Benefits from Nature tool](#) may be used to identify opportunities to enhance wider benefits from nature and to avoid and minimise any negative impacts. It is designed to work alongside [Biodiversity Metric 3.1](#) and is available as a beta test version.

Access and Recreation

Natural England encourages any proposal to incorporate measures to help improve people's access to the natural environment. Measures such as reinstating existing footpaths together with the creation of new footpaths and bridleways should be considered. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be delivered where appropriate.

Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails

Paragraphs 100 and 174 of the NPPF highlight the important of public rights of way and access. Development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the any nearby National Trails. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts.

Biodiversity duty

Your authority has a [duty](#) to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your decision making. Conserving biodiversity can also include restoration or enhancement to a population or habitat. Further information is available [here](#).

Environmental Protection Planning Consultation Response

To: Susannah Buylla - Head of Planning & Policy, Northumberland National Park Authority

From: Gary Park - Environmental Protection Officer, Environmental Protection Team, Public Health Protection Unit

Planning Reference: 22NP0066

Subject: Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029 extend

Location: Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65

SRU Reference: SRU159675

Date: 29/09/2022

I refer to your consultation and attachments of 23/08/2022.

Opinion

The Environmental Protection Team have no objection to this application.

Commentary

The Environmental Protection (EP) Team have undertaken a technical review of the submitted information and have assessed the environmental impacts which are relevant to the development and would comment as follows:

	Not Applicable	Objection	Considerations / Conditions
Contaminated Land	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ground Gas / Radon	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise / Vibration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Odour	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air Quality / Dust	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Private Water Supplies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lighting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Previous Consultations

The Environmental Protection Team at Northumberland County Council have provided consultation responses to a number of previous application for Harden Quarry including the recent application for the vertical extension to the quarry and the Review Of Mineral Planning (ROMP) permission.

However, the most relevant to this current application is 21NP0069 - Request for formal Scoping Opinion - Northern extension to quarry at Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Morpeth, Northumberland, NE65 7DX (our memo SRU151250 dated 06/10/2020).

1. Contaminated Land

The site has no historic, potentially-contaminative uses other than the contemporary use as a quarry. There are no vulnerable receptors in the normal scope of contamination risk.

Therefore, the site with its existing use and end users does not require any contamination risk assessment.

2. Ground Gas

The site does not fall within any Coal Authority Development Risk Area.

Parts of the quarry do fall within an area modelled to be at risk of radon gas where 3-5 percent of dwellings are predicted to be at risk from radon gas

However, none of the structures are of typical foundation design (daft/slab or suspended floor) and there are no receptors which might fall into the typical residential/commercial categories.

Therefore, the site with its existing use and end users does not require any radon gas risk assessment or inclusion of any gas protection measures in buildings.

3. Noise

Noise limits from quarry operations are set by "mineral planning" under Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 27-021-20140306 (Revision date: 06 03 2014) and Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 27-022-20140306 (Revision date: 06 03 2014) of Minerals Planning Guidance which can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/minerals>

For normal daytime operations this is not to exceed 10dB (decibels) above the measured background noise levels (ninetieth percentile) and not to exceed 55dB LAeq at the nearest receptors.

For any night-time operations the noise level should not exceed 42dB LAeq at the nearest receptors.

And, for noisy short-term activities a daytime noise limits of up to 70dB LAeq for periods of up to 8 weeks in a year.

However, the quarry only operates during the daytime period on Mondays to Friday (0700 to 1900) and Saturday (0700 to 1300).

Noise limits have previously been set under Condition 16 of planning permission 14NP0041 and they are:

Daytime Noise Limits (in dB(A))			
Existing Sensitive Receptor		Approx. Distance (m)	Noise Limit LAeq 1 hour
ESR1	Biddlestone Cottage	900/900	52
ESR2	The Priests House	530/560	50
ESR3	Biddlestone Home Farm	630/660	45
ESR4	Biddlestone Town Foot	75/160	45
ESR5	Singmoor	400/410	45

Distances are from site boundary/site operations

The noise emissions from the quarry operations have been assessed correctly following BS5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise, and the noise have been modelled using the SoundPLAN acoustic modelling software using the plant to be used currently and in the proposed lateral extension (including new locations to the north) and shows:

Predicted Noise Levels Against Permitted Noise Limits (in dB(A))					
Existing Sensitive Receptor		Predicted Normal Daytime Operations	Noise Limit LAeq 1 hour	Predicted Short-Term Exceptional Noise	Noise Limit LAeq 1 hour
ESR1	Biddlestone Cottage	38	52	37	70
ESR2	The Priests House	40	50	37	
ESR3	Biddlestone Home Farm	37	45	36	
ESR4	Biddlestone Town Foot	25	45	24	
ESR5	Singmoor	30	45	30	

For normal daytime operations the predicted noise levels are well below the limits set by planning as are the short-term, exceptional noise levels. The noise assessment has considered these impacts as having a negligible effect that is 'not significant' at the nearest noise sensitive receptors (NNSRs).

For comparison, typical ambient noise levels (in the absence of any specific continuous noise sources such as a quarry) can be in the range of 30 to 40dB LAeq, although this can vary greatly depending upon a number of factors such as weather conditions, proximity to roads, farming operations, time of year (ie birdsong) etc..

Noise limits in the WHO 1999 and BS 8233 guidance set a lower daytime external noise limit of 50dB LAeq from particular sources of noise and a daytime internal limit in dining rooms (and living rooms) of 40dB LAeq, it is generally accepted that an open window can attenuate noise by up to 15dB and therefore the external noise would have to be up to 55dB LAeq to exceed the internal daytime limit.

This is generally acceptable in demonstrating that compliance with the noise limits can be achieved in the quarry operations and as part of the proposed extension. It is recommended that the planning authority transfer over the noise limits included into the decision notice for 14NP0041 to this application should the permission be granted.

4. Vibration

Some blasting will be required in the extension to the quarry, as it is currently with the quarry operations.

Limits for ground vibration are contained in BS 6472-2 2008 which has a lower limit of 6 mms-1 which is the lower limit in the range of human perception of blasts (up to three per

day) and far lower than the 15-20mms-1 in the range of 4-15 Hertz and 20-50mms1 in the range of 15-40 Hertz vibration limits for cosmetic damage to residential dwellings (BS 7385-2:1993).

Historically, an upper ground vibration limit of 12mms-1 has been included in decision notices for mineral sites. This comes from the former Mineral Planning Guidance (MPG) 9 and 14 with a suggested range of between 6 to 10 mms-1 at a 95% confidence level measured at sensitive property, with no individual blast to exceed 12 mms-1.

For air overpressure, there are no specific limits in guidance, partly because metrological conditions can greatly influence the resulting decibel level at receptors. However, typically, blasting does not normally exceed 125dB and some mineral planning authorities in the UK have adopted a maximum air overpressure limit of 120 dB peak linear.

The submitted vibration report includes the following:

“Blasting operations shall be carried out so that all blast vibration as measured at the nearest sensitive properties is less than 12 mm/s peak particle velocity and 95-99% of all blast vibration as measured at the nearest sensitive properties is less than 6 mm/s peak particle velocity. Blasting operations shall be carried out that all blast air overpressure as measured at the nearest sensitive properties is < 120 dB.”

Measured vibration carried out by Tarmac at 400 metres distance shows:

Peak Particle Velocity (mms-1) of:

Long – 0.07 to 3.13

Vertical – 1.29 to 3.56

Transverse – 0.66 to 2.58

And Air Overpressure (dB) of 105 to 120dB

Measured vibration carried out by Vibrock at various location on the quarry site shows:

Peak Particle Velocity (mms-1) of:

Long - 1.95 to 62.4

Vert - 2.53 to 48.4

Transverse - 2.13 to 42.8

And Air Overpressure (dB) of 119 to 125dB

Also, ground-borne measurements carried out at 400 metres (The Priest's House) all below 0.5 mms-1.

The decision notice for 14NP0041 does include a condition limiting ground vibration (Condition 21) but none limiting air overpressure.

This is generally acceptable in demonstrating that compliance with accepted official and unofficial vibration limits that be achieved in the quarry operations as part of the proposed extension. It is recommended that the planning authority transfer over vibration condition included into the decision notice for 14NP0041 to this application should the permission be granted.

5. Odour

The process does not involve the generation of any types of odour which would require consideration.

6. Air Quality / Dust

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive dust risk assessment covering amenity dust, PM10 and PM2.5.

The assessment has looked at the nearest receptors, distances and the typical wind vectors which are almost “standard” around Northumberland.

For the majority of the time, wind in Northumberland comes from the South-West to West and the data used to demonstrate this for the quarry site indicates that wind comes from these vectors for thirty-five per cent of the year. This indicates that the primary receptors for any entrained dust is to the East and North-East.

However, at Harden Quarry the extraction and processing is a wet process of a hardstone. Typically, dust emissions transmission from hardstone quarries is limited to 400 metres from the site operations even when there is limited mitigation.

Additionally, the report quite correctly states that the IAQM Minerals Guidance states:

“If the long-term background PM10 concentration is less than 17 µg/m3 there is little risk that the Process Contribution (PC) would lead to an exceedance of the annual mean objective and such a finding can be put forward qualitatively, without the need for further consideration, in most cases.”

There are two gridded points in the DEFRA background maps in the immediate location; one about 250 metres west of the quarry and the other east of the quarry over Biddlestone Town Fort. The last five year’s data (2018 to 2022) these two points are – West; 7.7, 8.0, 7.8, 7.7 and 7.6 µg/m3 AND East; 10.4, 9.9, 9.9, 9.9, 9.7 µg/m3.

The site is required to have an environmental permit issued by the local authority under The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulation 2016 (as amended), current version reference EPN22/096 issued 22 September 2022. The purpose of this permit is to limit emission to air and also for the operator to demonstrate and comply with methods to mitigate emissions which can be operational, physical and/or managerial.

The site operates under a dust management plan (DMP) required by Condition 19 of 14NP0041.

The site is also subject to a bi-annual dust assessment, currently carried out by SOCOTEC and there have been no complaints of dust from the quarry operations at any of the nearest receptors.

This is generally acceptable in demonstrating that compliance with accepted guidance dust limits (including PM10 and PM2.5) have and can be achieved in the quarry operations as part of the proposed extension. It is recommended that the planning authority transfer over the dust management plan included into the decision notice for 14NP0041 to this application should the permission be granted

7. Private Water Supply

There are several spring water supplies used for human consumption within the area, the nearest spring rises some 250 metres to west from the current quarry operations, to the south of the Biddlestone Burn and at a greater height than the quarry floor. This source will be even further from the proposed extension.

The proposal is for lateral extension to the quarry, the quarry previously had permitted a vertical extension to allow the quarry floor to be dropped below the previous level in part

of the quarry. The quarry floor is above the existing aquifer level and should have no impact upon the underlying aquifer.

Consultation with the lead officer in the Private Water Supply team within the Environmental Protection Team at Northumberland County Council did not raise any issues suggesting that the previously accepted vertical extension would have any detrimental impact upon these spring supplies. Therefore, it is expected that the proposed lateral extension would have no greater impact than the vertical one did.

8. Lighting

The quarry process only operates during the daytime period, although during the winter months there may be periods of work which are carried out once the sun has set. The site does not currently have any substantial fixed artificial illumination and the nearest residential receptors are at significant distance where compliance with guidance would likely be met even if there were any installation of fixed artificial lighting.

9. Other

None.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the NNPA impose where relevant the conditions for noise, vibration and air quality where they were included for previous permissions for the site including (but not limited to) 14NP0041 and 22NP0006.

Informatives

Fuel Storage

Any onsite storage of fuels of oils should be stored following appropriate guidance and banded to 110 percent of capacity.

The legislation covering the onsite storage of fuels of oils is The Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001 which is regulated by the Environment Agency.

Procedures should be in place for dealing with catastrophic spillages of any liquids which may have an impact upon land contamination and / or aquifers

Officer	GJP
EP Checked	N/A



Colin Godfrey
Northumberland National Park Authority
Eastburn
South Park
Hexham
Northumberland
NE46 1BS

Planning Ref: 22/03088/CNA
Your Ref:
Contact: Mr David Love
Direct Line: 07517553360
E-Mail: [REDACTED]
Date: 31st October 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Proposal Reference 22NP0066 - Observations to be made by 13.9.2022 - Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029 extending to 2054

Location Harden Quarry Biddlestone Morpeth Northumberland
NE65 7DX

Applicant Colin Godfrey Northumberland National Park Authority

I would confirm that Development Management have **No Objection** to the above consultation.

Yours Faithfully

Mr David Love
Planning Officer

Highways Development Management
Planning Application Consultation Response

Planning application number: 22NP0066

Description of development: Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029 extending to 2054

Location: Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, NE65 7DX

Date: 23rd November 2022

RECOMMENDATION:

Imposition and implementation of condition (s): Required to ensure acceptability

Assessment of proposal:

When assessing a variation to a planning application, the Highway Authority checks that any proposed variation does not have an adverse impact on the safety of all users of the highway or on the wider local highway network.

Harden Quarry is located on the boundary of the Northumberland National Park, approximately 12 km northwest of Rothbury, The Quarry currently operates under conditions imposed upon it by the Northumberland National Park Authority (NNPA) Planning Permissions 14NP0057.

The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) states the quarry currently extracts up to 150,000 tonnes per annum of stone, with the majority of the HGV's vehicles travelling to / from the A697 in the east via haulage routes comprising of an 'inbound only' route through Rothbury to the A697 and an 'outbound only' route through Whittingham.

Highway Development Management (HDM) previously provided a response to a pre-application which set out a requirement for additional information related to the number of HGVs that the site currently generates, the impact on highway safety, and confirmation that Tarmac would enter into an agreement to undertake resurfacing works on the U4017, between the site access and its junction with the U4022.

Chapter 14 of the EIA covers the potential transportation and highway impacts of the proposed lateral extension of Harden Quarry. To ensure the development is in accordance with the national guidance and local policy.

The chapter covers the existing highway conditions, inclusive of available traffic flow data and personal injury collision (PIC) data in the area. It also sets out the impact the proposed development will have in highway and transportation terms, including access arrangements, operational details, traffic generation and the distribution / assignment of vehicle trips on the highway network, and highway safety, particularly in relation to all road users, i.e. drivers, cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians within the study area, and identifies mitigation measures (where required).

The proposed quarry extension does not seek to change the overall quantity of stone that will be extracted per annum, nor does it propose to alter the vehicle movements currently permitted.

HDM are satisfied that a robust assessment has been undertaken of the impact the development will have on the highway network. Including the impact on highway safety in relation to all users of the highway, provided clarification of the numbers of anticipated HGV movements and a commitment by the applicant to carry out mitigation measures on the highway network identified.

It has been stated that Tarmac currently implements a Route Management Plan which would remain active with the extension of the quarry, and Tarmac accept that new mitigation measures are required, and propose road repairs / improvements on the A4017 that will be agreed with the Highway Authority.

Therefore, if the Planning Authority is minded to approve this application HDM have no objection to the variation of planning permission 14NP0057, with previously recommended highways conditions relating to the number of movements, record keeping of HGV movements, sheeting of vehicles and the prevention of mud stone etc being deposited on the highway, along with additional conditions to secure the routing of HGV's and the proposed road repairs / improvements set out above. Along with the continuation of the Highway Agreements with the Highways Authority re contributions towards maintenance of the highway due to extraordinary traffic transferred to the 22NP0066 decision notice.

Planning Obligations, Conditions and Informatives:

Necessary planning obligations, conditions and informatives recommended for planning approval.

S106 Heads of Terms
None
S278/S38/S59/S184 Requirements
S59 – Requirement in relation to the extraordinary maintenance placed upon the Highway Authority as a result of the development proposals. An agreement will need to be entered into with the Highway Authority in relation to the proposed for road repairs / improvements on the A4017.
Recommended Conditions
Conditions to be carried over from 14NP0057: a) Restriction to the number of HGV movements leaving the site, b) Record kept of HGV movements, c) Vehicles carrying stone and loose material to be sheeted, d) Measure to prevent mud stone etc being deposited on the highway. Additional Conditions: *NOTE: Additional conditions to be formulated in liaison with the Planning Authority* *HGV Routing Strategy Prior to the commencement of any lateral extension to the quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029, a routing strategy which shall incorporate adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in Liaison with the Highway Authority together with proposals to control and manage vehicle movements and to ensure no inappropriate local roads are used by associated large vehicles. Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety. *Completion of highway works before lateral extension to the quarry and time extension to operational life. Prior to the commencement of any lateral extension to the quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029, a scheme to carry out improvements to the highway, including a timetable, must be

submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide for road repairs / improvements on the A4017 as set out in the submitted Environmental Statement. The scheme shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved detail and timetable.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity

Recommended Informatives

Highway Agreement re highway works

You are advised that offsite highway works required in connection with this permission will require an agreement under the Highway Act 1980. These works should be carried out prior to the lateral extension to the quarry and time extension to operational life. All such works will be undertaken under the supervision of the Council at the applicant's expense. You should contact Highway Development Management at highwaysplanning@northumberland.gov.uk to progress this matter.

Section 59 Agreement - Extraordinary Expenses

You are advised to contact the Council's Highway Development Management team at highwaysplanning@northumberland.gov.uk concerning the Section 59 Agreement of the Highway Act 1980 relating to extraordinary expenses

From: [Lorna Lazzari](#)
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX
Date: 23 August 2022 15:10:19

Dear Colin

Thank you for consulting me on the proposals for the land at Harden Quarry.

Having looked at the plans, I would envisage that the proposals should not impact on any public right of way or other access opportunities in the area.

I therefore have no objection.

Yours sincerely
Lorna

From: DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>
Sent: 23 August 2022 14:32
To: Lorna Lazzari [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=22NP0066>

—
DC Consultation
[Development Control Consultation](#)
(x)

DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk

—
Lorna Lazzari
[Access & National Trails Officer](#)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX
Date: 06 October 2022 23:59:16

Dear Susannah,

Application 22NP0066

Proposed Development : Variation to planning permission 14NP0057 for a lateral extension to quarry and time extension to operational life beyond its current permitted end date of 2029 extending to 2054 at Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX

Thank you for consulting me on the above planning application. Having looked at the comprehensive set of documents provided by the applicant I would like to make the following comments with respect to the likely effects of the proposed development set out in the application on the landscape character, views, setting, notable trees and Dark Skies Park status of this part of the National Park.

Harden Quarry lies on the boundary between the Cheviots and Cheviot Fringe National Character Areas. I believe that the following Statements of Environmental opportunity are relevant in this case.

Cheviot Fringe NCA

SEO4

- Ensuring that future development and extraction do not remove possible key sites and sections with the potential to lead to greater understanding of ice sheet behaviour in the region, such as the Milfield Fan. Taking opportunities arising from sand, gravel and stone extraction to record temporary sections and retain permanent geological sections through the restoration process, where appropriate.
- Utilising opportunities to unearth research and preserve a wealth of archaeological artefacts revealed through mineral extraction, such as in the Milfield Plain, and ensuring that these valuable assets are protected for future generations.
- Conserving archaeological earthworks and sub-surface archaeology, while recognising the potential for undiscovered remains, through the employment of land management practices that minimise disturbance and damage from cultivation such as controlling scrub, minimising the use of heavy vehicles, taking archaeological features out of cultivation and encouraging arable reversion where possible.

Cheviots NCA

SEO2

- Improving access to and providing imaginative interpretation of geological sites and features, including designated sites and quarries, and exploring the possibility of geo-trails, to enhance the public's understanding and enjoyment of the area.

- Encouraging sympathetic land management and use to protect the wealth of archaeological features from damage by people, livestock, land management practices and encroachment by bracken and scrub.

The 2019 Landscape Character Assessment for Northumberland National Park identifies that the site lies within the Rounded Hills Landscape Character Type, specifically the Cheviot Rounded Hills Landscape Character Area. It is noted that “Quarrying of natural stone resources has caused localised scarring of the landscape”.

The Strategy for land management going forward identified that “ This landscape is an open, remote and wild one, where the influences of man are generally not prominent, and where topography and vegetation create a visual simplicity. The rarity of these characteristics and their sensitivity to even very small changes suggest that the overall strategy for this area should be one of conservation and sensitive management”.

No specific guidelines for development relating to the quarrying of minerals are identified.

Observations

Following on from my comment made at the pre-app stage of this proposed development in my email of 10th July 2021 I can confirm that I am happy that the points raised within that correspondence have been addressed and the level of detail suggested has been provided in the form of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment document and the supporting viewpoint photography and visualisation material. The visualisation material for viewpoints 1 and 5 are welcomed, setting out the difference in the views gained from these receptor sites at four points in time including, existing view, predicted view at Phase 1 of the development, at restoration stage and at 25 years from the development taking place.

In relation to the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment I can confirm that I am happy with the conclusions reached for both the assessment of landscape effects and assessment of visual effects. However, as identified in the Phase 1, 2 and 3 plans and the LVIA document, the importance of existing and proposed additional tree planting is mentioned in helping to soften and screen the development from various viewpoints. There is reference to the long-term maintenance and retention of this woodland, gorse and tree cover but I could not find amongst the application documentation a Forestry Commission style [Woodland Management Plan](#) as requested and noted by the applicant in my comments in Table 5.1 on page 5.9 of the Pre-application Engagement and Consideration of Alternatives document. To ensure the retention and ongoing maintenance of the existing and proposed new woodland on site post restoration, I would suggest that, through a condition, a woodland management plan is produced identifying the type and purpose of the woodland and recording the fact that this will be managed as continuous forest cover in perpetuity as part of the mitigation measures associated with this development. As we have seen recently with Storm Arwen in which 95% of the trees blown down across the National Park were conifer species, the importance of establishing a native resilient woodland, able to provide visual screening without the risk of succumbing to windthrow is imperative. I note and can confirm that I am happy with the tree species identified in the text on the restoration plan.

With respect to possible impact upon the Dark Sky Park status of the National Park, paragraph

6.4.15 stipulates that the external lighting level will remain as existing. From memory, following the site visit in June 2021 there were a couple of spot lights on the office accommodation unit that were not Dark Sky Compliant but other than that there were no significant additional implications for the Dark Sky status of the National Park. Should this application be approved, I would recommend that a condition be considered, stipulating that existing external lighting on site needs to be brought into line with the NNP [Dark Sky Park Lighting Master Plan](#) prior to the commencement of any work associated with the proposed extended use of the quarry. The Authority could offer an officer site visit if clarification on this matter was needed.

I can confirm that I do not believe that there will be implications for any ancient, veteran or notable trees as a result of this proposed development.

One small correction in the LVIA text I would bring to your attention is that in paragraph 6.3.22, it should read “National Cycle Route 68, also known as the [Pennine Cycleway](#)” and not the Pennine Way which is the walking route that passes along the Border Ridge, was to the west of the proposed development site on the Otterburn Training Area.

In summary, I welcome the level of detail that the applicant has produced for this application and can confirm that I do not object to the proposal for a further lateral extension of operation and time extension for operation through to 2054, agreeing with the applicant’s assessment that the impacts upon the landscape character and views of this part of the National Park as a result of the proposed development are unlikely to be significant. I would however ask that you consider the points raised above with respect to the use of certain conditions, should this application be put forward for approval.

If you have any queries with the points set out above please do not hesitate to get back in touch.

Kind regards

Robert Mayhew
Head of Conservation and Environment
Northumberland National Park
[REDACTED]

From: DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>
Sent: 23 August 2022 14:32
To: Robert Mayhew [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=22NP0066>

—

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX
Date: 11 October 2022 18:29:30

Dear Susannah,

Thanks for consulting me on the above application. I can confirm that the applicant's archaeological consultant has entered into extensive discussions regarding the implications of a lateral extension to the quarry on the historic environment. The comments on this application are consistent with those provided for 21NP0012 (12th March 2021).

The scheme proposed will cause substantial harm (total physical loss) of non-designated heritage assets (described in the cultural heritage chapter of the EIA). The scheme will also have indirect impacts to the setting of 1 scheduled monument beyond the site boundary. Previous assessments include extensive geophysical and earthwork surveys and archaeological evaluation. Recently this has been augmented by a setting study (April 2022).

The work carried out to-date has established the presence, significance and potential of the historic environment to inform decision making, in line with published guidance and established best practice. Discussions between the applicant's archaeological consultant, Historic England and the National Park Authority's Historic Environment Officer has resulted in the production of a robust mitigation scheme to reduce the scale of the impacts upon non-designated archaeological remains and to secure wider public benefit.

There will be some harm to the setting of the scheduled monument 1008562 *Palisaded settlement on Bleakmoor Hill*. However, the landscape scheme will reduce the level of this harm to an acceptable extent.

I can confirm that, on the basis of the agreed and submitted mitigation scheme, I have no objection to the proposals. This has taken into account the comments to 21NP0012 which stated that *"Any approval should be conditional upon the commissioning of a full programme of archaeological work, including 100% excavation of selected features, combined with an agreed programme of environmental sampling to augment the dating evidence available."*

Should you require further information or explanation of this response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Chris

From: DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>
Sent: 23 August 2022 15:37
To: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX
Date: 06 October 2022 10:23:18

Dear Susannah,

Thank you for consulting me on this application. In general I agree with the findings of the ecological report and chapter that no protected sites are likely to be adversely affected. Of the species and habitats on site I do consider that the table at 7.10 is a reasonable summary of the potential effects of the proposals. With regard to waxcaps I have assessed against these against the JNCC SSSI criteria (which the site does not meet) and the Rald index, and it does seem to come out as regionally important rather than locally. There are however no particular rarities and the site is not considered a particularly important one in the Northumberland National Park compared to other sites we have observed, and loss would not be a reason to object to the proposals. Loss of the site should however be considered in terms of Biodiversity Net Gain calculations (see below).

Biodiversity Net Gain – In sections 7.10.15 and 7.15.3 it is noted that there is over an above the 10% net gain we asked for. Appendix 7.4 shows 11.9% but this is just a one page extract so I don't know how this has been calculated and which areas have been used. There is reference to 'off-site' areas e.g. in section 7.11.4. I am confused as to where this is – I think this needs mapping and better explanation; they are not shown on the restoration I don't think. We need to be convinced that this 10%+ is over and above the restoration suggested in the previous plan. Comparing the current restoration plan and the previous map I can see that the broadleaved planting is basically the same except the small area of gorse scrub around the proposed new north rim. I think we could do with some clarification on this point.

Restoration plan – I'm happy with the species suggested for the broadleaved woodland. I note they have removed the Ash that was on the original list and replaced with sessile oak. Also the wetland species listed are native and acceptable and gorse as the scrub species around the rim.

Invasive species – pirri pirri burr can be very invasive and there is a strong likelihood of it escaping the site so removal and proper disposal is important. Movement during the top soil movement and storage is particularly likely. Is there a method statement for dealing with the species? I can't find it if there is and I think this should be submitted – there is mention in 7.10.21 of monitoring and removal only.

I note that Natural England have no comments on the proposals.

I am leaning towards no objections regarding this if we can clarify that enough BNG has been submitted and there is a method statement for the pirri-pirri burr. The other precautions around badgers and red squirrels and reptiles as mentioned in the mitigation

should be conditioned. The grassland, scrub, woodland and wetland habitat on the site post restoration and red squirrel habitat retention are similar/the same as previously submitted and accepted in the restoration plan.

If you wish to discuss further please get back to me, particularly around the BNG one you have met with the applicant as per our recent discussion.

Regards,
Gill Thompson

From: DC Consultation <DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk>
Sent: 23 August 2022 14:32
To: Gill Thompson [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX

Please see the attached consultation regarding a planning application which has been received by Northumberland National Park Authority. Full details can be viewed at <http://nnpa.planning-register.co.uk/plaPlanningAppDisplay.aspx?AppNo=22NP0066>

DC Consultation
[Development Control Consultation](#)
(x)

DC.Consultation@nnpa.org.uk

Gill Thompson (she/her)
[Ecologist](#)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Gill Thompson](#)
To: [DC Consultation](#)
Cc: [Susannah Buylia](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 22NP0066 Harden Quarry, Biddlestone, Netherton, Rothbury, Northumberland, NE65 7DX
Date: 19 December 2022 13:15:16

Dear Susannah,

Further to my comments on the 6th of October I have read the revised and resubmitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment dated the 1st December.

My previous comments made reference to the 'off-site' area which I can now see on the map/aerial view, which clarifies the issue and location outside the current working area.

I can see that in section D.1.3. that the comparison between the current agreed scheme and the proposed scheme is compared as I asked in my previous reply. I read this that the current proposals will result in 11.95% biodiversity net gain vs 10.12% in the existing approved scheme. More than 10% biodiversity net gain will be achieved and earlier than the existing agreed plans which I think is acceptable.

It is proposed to submit a detailed Landscape and Ecology Management Plan with some suggestions on content. I agree this would be a good way to ensure delivery and can include the timings so habitat restoration/creation can begin in certain areas as soon as possible.

I am happy with the method statement for the control of piri piri burr (with the additional clarification from 2015) and for this to be added as a condition or included in the management plan.

I note Natural England have no objections.

I therefore have no objections to the application if all the above are noted and conditioned. Other previous comments in the 06/10/2022 reply are still relevant.

If you wish to discuss further please get back in touch.

Yours sincerely,
Gill Thompson