



Environmental Impact Assessment - Statement of Conformity Report

Phase 1 Reserved Matters

Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire

Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited

May 2020

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Approach and EIA Methodology.....	4
3.	Site Context and Background	6
4.	Alternatives	7
5.	The Proposed Development	8
6.	Planning Policy Context.....	12
7.	Socioeconomics.....	14
8.	Landscape and Visual.....	15
9.	Ecology	17
10.	Archaeology and Heritage.....	19
11.	Ground Conditions.....	20
12.	Drainage and Flood Risk.....	21
13.	Transport and Access.....	22
14.	Air Quality.....	23
15.	Noise and Vibration.....	25
16.	Waste	26
17.	Summary and Conclusions.....	27

Appendices

Appendix I	2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) - Site Location Plan
Appendix II	2019 Reserved Matters Application (ref. SMD/2019/0646) – Site Location Plan
Appendix III	2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Parameters Plan
Appendix IV	2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Eaves Lane Access Plan
Appendix V	2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Restoration Plan
Appendix VI	2019 Reserved Matters Application (ref. SMD/2019/0646) – Site Masterplan
Appendix VII	Photomontages – Planit-ie
Appendix VIII	Ecological Baseline Review – Bowland Ecology
Appendix IX	Air Quality Assessment: Cellarhead Junction – BWB

Prepared By: **Jamie Lynch**
 Reviewed By: **Richard Kevan**
 Status: Final
 Draft Date: April 2020

For and on behalf of **Avison Young**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Avison Young has been appointed by Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited ('the Applicant') to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") Statement of Conformity ("SoC") Report in respect of the Phase 1 reserved matters planning application (as amended) (ref. SMD/2019/0646) (hereafter referred to as the '2019 reserved matters application') at Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire (hereafter referred to as 'the site'). The 2019 reserved matters application is submitted pursuant to the approved outline application (ref. SMD/2016/0378) (hereafter referred to as the '2016 outline application [or permission]'). The Site Location Plans for the 2016 outline permission and 2019 reserved matters application are included at **Appendix I and II** respectively.
- 1.2 The 2016 outline planning application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement ("ES") (hereafter referred to as the 'June 2016 ES') prepared by HOW Planning (now part of Avison Young) on behalf of the Applicant.
- 1.3 The ES provided with the 2016 outline permission can be accessed using the reference 'SMD/2016/0378' at the following link:
- <https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/article/564/Comment-on-an-application>
- 1.4 The June 2016 ES is also available for viewing at SMDC's offices: Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 6HQ. Further copies of the ES are available on CD at a cost of £35 from Avison Young. Hard copies of the ES can be prepared upon request, a quote for reasonable printing and distribution charges will be sourced upon any request.
- 1.5 When considering the 2019 reserved matters application it is necessary to consider how the EIA Regulations¹ apply to "subsequent application(s)" which are defined as:
- "...an application for approval of a matter where the approval:*
- (a) Is required by or under a condition to which a planning permission is subject; and*
 - (b) Must be obtained before all or part of the development permitted by the planning permission may be begun."*²
- 1.6 The EIA Regulations contain a prohibition on a development consent for EIA development, including subsequent applications, being granted unless there has been an assessment of the likely significant effects of the development. As such, the EIA Regulations seek to ensure the determining authority for the development consent is able to make its decision in the full knowledge of any likely significant environmental effects.
- 1.7 This Report reviews the proposed details for approval via the 2019 reserved matters application in the context of the ES prepared for the 2016 outline planning application. This report aims to assess whether the

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (England) (SI571/ 2017), DCLG, London

² Defined within the 2017 EIA Regulations, Section 2 "Interpretation"

EIA prepared to support the 2016 outline planning application remains adequate to assess the significant effects of the development on the environment, including those matters which should be taken into consideration when determining the 2019 reserved matters application.

- 1.8 If, however, Staffordshire Moorlands District Council ("SMDC") determine that the environmental information is not considered adequate to assess the significant environmental effects of the development, within the provisions of Regulations 9(3), then SMDC would need to make a direction for further environmental information under Regulation 25 requesting the provision of specific further environmental information.
- 1.9 Provision for subsequent applications where environmental information has been previously provided is set out within Regulation 9 of the 2017 EIA Regulations, which states:

9.—(1) This regulation applies where it appears to the relevant planning authority that—

(a) an application which is before them for determination—

(i) is a subsequent application in relation to Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development;

(ii) has not itself been the subject of a screening opinion or screening direction; and

(iii) is not accompanied by a statement referred to by the applicant as an environmental statement for the purposes of these Regulations; and

(b) either—

(i) the application for planning permission to which the subsequent application relates was accompanied by a statement referred to by the applicant as an environmental statement for the purposes of these Regulations; or

(ii) the application is for the approval of a matter where the approval is required by or under a condition to which planning permission deemed by section 10(1) of the Crossrail Act 2008(a) (Planning) or section 20(1) or 50(5)(a) of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Act 2017(b) (Deemed planning permission) and (Enforcement of environmental covenants) is subject.

(2) Where it appears to the relevant planning authority that the environmental information already before them is adequate to assess the significant effects of the development on the environment, they must take that information into consideration in their decision for subsequent consent.

(3) Where it appears to the relevant planning authority that the environmental information already before them is not adequate to assess the significant effects of the development on the environment, they must serve a notice seeking further information in accordance with regulation 25.

Report Structure

- 1.10 This Reports contains an EIA SoC for the technical disciplines which formed part of the 2016 ES. This Report has been prepared and coordinated by Avison Young, with input from technical consultants where necessary.
- 1.11 The structure of this Report is presented in Table 1.1, corresponding to each chapter of the June 2016 ES. Alongside each chapter heading is an indication of the approach i.e. SoC and/or review of environmental information.

Table 1.1: Structure and Content of this Report

No.	Title	Content of the Chapter
1.	Introduction	Overview of the document's purpose, context and content.
2.	Approach and EIA Methodology	Review of the approach to the June 2016 ES.
3.	Site Context and Background	Overview of the site and background to the development.
4.	Alternatives	Statement of Conformity.
5.	The Proposed Development	Details of the 2016 outline and 2019 reserved matters applications.
6.	Planning Policy Context	Review of any amendments to planning policy.
7.	Socioeconomics	Statement of Conformity.
8.	Landscape and Visual	Statement of Conformity.
9.	Ecology	Statement of Conformity and Review of the Environmental Effects.
10.	Archaeology and Heritage	Statement of Conformity.
11.	Ground Conditions	Statement of Conformity.
12.	Drainage and Flood Risk	Statement of Conformity.
13.	Transport and Access	Statement of Conformity.
14.	Air Quality and Dust	Statement of Conformity and Review of the Environmental Effects.
15.	Noise and Vibration	Statement of Conformity.
16.	Waste	Statement of Conformity.
17.	Cumulative Effects	Statement of Conformity.
18.	Summary and Conclusions	Statement of Conformity.

- 1.12 This Report has also been subject to legal review by Leading Counsel Paul G Tucker QC, Kings Chambers. Advice from Counsel has informed the approach to the assessment to ensure the Report is legally robust.

2. Approach and EIA Methodology

2.1 Consideration has been given to the validity of the original studies reported within each of the technical chapters of the June 2016 ES. The significance of effects within each technical chapter has been reviewed against the details of the 2019 reserved matters application to ensure that the significance of residual effects previously reported in the June 2016 ES remain valid. For the majority of the technical areas, the requirement for supporting information is limited; however, in some cases more detailed analysis is required alongside additional evaluation. Where this is the case, this is presented within each relevant technical chapter.

EIA Regulatory Compliance

2.2 The 2016 ES was prepared in accordance with the 2011 EIA Regulations. The amended EIA Directive (2014/52/EU) entered into force in May 2014. The amended EIA Directive was transposed into legislation in England on 16 May 2017. There is a period of transition following the publication of the 2017 EIA Regulations and the existing 2011 EIA Regulations still applied for any project that has already commenced by way of a request for a Screening or Scoping Opinion or through the submission of an ES.

2.3 Notwithstanding the transitional arrangements in place, the 2016 ES has been reviewed in light of the 2017 EIA Regulations to ensure conformity with the latest set of Regulations governing EIA process in England. It is not considered that the scope and approach of the 2016 ES would require amendment following implementation of the 2017 EIA Regulations.

2.4 This EIA SoC Report has therefore been prepared in accordance with the 2017 EIA Regulations, and the predecessor secondary legislation.

EIA Assessment Parameters

2.5 The assessment criteria, magnitude of change, sensitivity of receptors and assessment of effect significance remains as set out within **Chapter 2: Approach** of the submitted June 2016 ES.

2.6 The parameters which formed the basis of the assessment within the June 2016 ES are presented within Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: June 2016 ES Assessment Parameters

EIA Parameter	Purpose	Appendix Reference
Outline Planning Application Boundary	Defines the extent of the site and the proposed development.	Appendix I
Parameters Plan	Defines the type of development, maximum building heights and open space within identified zones.	Appendix III
Means of Access Plan	Defines the means of access to the site, which have been applied for in detail.	Appendix IV

EIA Parameter	Purpose	Appendix Reference
Restoration Plan	The approved restoration plan for the quarry represents the baseline for the assessments in the EIA.	Appendix V

Cumulative Effects

- 2.7 The June 2016 ES included a cumulative effects assessment which considered the potential environmental effects of the proposed development in conjunction with any other committed developments. The June 2016 ES identified potential cumulative effects associated with two schemes:
- Moneystone Solar farm (ref. SMD/2015/022); and
 - Bolton Copperworks, Froghall (ref. SMD/2014/0668).
- 2.8 Following its approval, the Moneystone Solar Farm has now been constructed and is operational. There wasn't a subsequent planning application following the submission of the EIA Scoping Report for Bolton Copperworks. There were however two additional planning applications (ref. SMD/2016/0246 and SMD/2016/0567) on or adjacent to the Bolton Copperworks site for the change of use of the existing industrial units from manufacturing to storage and distribution. These are however both minor planning applications which have since been approved.
- 2.9 SMDC have also identified two residential developments (ref. SMD/2019/0723 and SMD/2018/0180) located within the town of Cheadle approximately 3km southwest of the proposed development. Following a review of these additional sites, it is not anticipated there would be additional significant cumulative effects associated with the proposed development in combination with these developments. Whilst there would be additional vehicles on the local highways network, it is not considered this would result in significant cumulative effects such that this requires a supplemental EIA to be prepared.
- 2.10 Two full planning applications have also been submitted at the Moneystone site. These include a Change of Use ("CoU") application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) and a surface water outfall application (ref. SMD/2019/0725). With regard to the CoU and outfall applications, the principal cumulative effects relate to construction phase effects which would be effectively managed with the measures which were set out and assessed in the June 2016 ES and conditioned on the decision notices. These include preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP") and Construction Ecological Management Plan ("CEcMP") amongst other commonplace measures. It is not considered that the CoU and outfall proposals, in combination with the approved development at Moneystone Quarry, or any other development, will result in significant construction phase cumulative effects such that they require assessment in an EIA.
- 2.11 In the long term, there are not anticipated to be any further significant cumulative effects above those identified in the June 2016 ES. The majority of the uses sought for approval via the CoU application formed part of the proposals in the 2016 outline application and therefore it is not considered there would be any additional cumulative effects during the operational phase which would result in a significant effect.
- 2.12 On this basis, it is not considered that a revised cumulative effects assessment needs to be undertaken by the Applicant.

3. Site Context and Background

Site History and Planning Background

3.1 The application site was granted outline planning permission on 26 October 2016 (ref. SMD/2016/0378). The approved description of development is as follows:

“Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of a high quality leisure development comprising holiday lodges; a new central hub building (providing swimming pool, restaurant, bowling alley, spa, gym, informal screen/cinema room, children's soft play area, cafe, shop and sports hall); cafe; visitor centre with farm shop; administration building; maintenance building; archery centre; watersports centre; equipped play areas; multi-sports area; ropewalks; car parking; and managed footpaths, cycleways and bridleways set in attractive landscaping and ecological enhancements (re-submission of Planning Application SMD/2014/0682).”

3.2 The extent of the 2016 outline permission is identified on the location plan at **Appendix I**. The planning application set a series of development parameters by identifying land use and height parameters which were used to inform the assessment presented within the ES and provided at **Appendix III to V**. As required by condition 4 on the 2016 outline planning permission, the development should be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:

- Red Line Location Plan PL1088.M.106 rev 3;
- Parameters Plan PL1088.M.110 rev 6;
- Character Areas Plan PL1088.M.113 rev 3;
- Eaves Lane Access Plan PB5196-0100 rev C;
- Proposed Layout of A52/Whiston Eaves Lane Junction PB1608/SK001 rev C;
- Existing and Restored Landscape Plan (drawing ref. PL1088.M116 Rev 1); and
- Environmental Statement (Moneystone Park) – June 2016.

3.3 The 2019 reserved matters application, as amended, reflects the approved plans and documents set out above and the proposals are within the parameters assessed in the June 2016 ES.

Current Site Conditions

3.4 With the exception of the ongoing restoration works on site, there haven't been any further demolition or construction activities since planning permission was granted for the 2016 outline application.

4. Alternatives

- 4.1 A robust alternatives assessment was undertaken as part of the June 2016 ES in accordance with the EIA Regulations. This assessment would satisfy the requirements of the 2017 EIA Regulations and therefore no further information is considered necessary or appropriate as part of the reserved matters application. Furthermore, the development secured outline planning approval in 2016, therefore no alternatives sites to the proposed development have been considered as part of the 2019 reserved matters application.
- 4.2 As part of the 2019 reserved matters application extensive detailed design analysis was undertaken to inform the proposals and therefore a range of design solutions were tested to inform the final scheme. Further detail can be found within the Design and Access Statement (NBDA Architects, October 2019) which is submitted with the 2019 reserved matters application.

5. The Proposed Development

5.1 The quantum of development approved as part of the 2016 outline permission is set out in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: Schedule of Approved Development

Development Zone	Uses	Quantum
Lodges	Lodges	Up to 250
Main Hub Building and Visitor Centre	Swimming pool and toddler pool	Up to 415 sqm
	Restaurant/ Bar and outside terrace	Up to 500 sqm
	Bowling alley	Up to 140 sqm
	Spa	Up to 150 sqm
	Gym with studio	Up to 100 sqm
	Informal screen room	Up to 80 sqm
	Children's soft play area	Up to 145 sqm
	Café	Up to 70 sqm
	Sports hall	Up to 320 sqm
	Reception area	Up to 145 sqm
	Shop	Up to 50 sqm
Archery Centre and Lakeside Café	Visitor centre with farm shop	Up to 490 sqm
	Lake café	Up to 130 sqm
Administration Block and Maintenance Depot	Archery centre	Up to 260 sqm
	Administration building	Up to 525 sqm
Additional uses – Multi Activity Hub Area	Maintenance depot	Up to 500 sqm
	Substation	Up to 600 sqm
	Multi-Sports area	Up to 1,400 sqm
	Equipped play area	Up to 500 sqm
	Adventure play area	Up to 500 sqm
	Ropewalks	Up to 5,000 sqm

5.2 The submitted 2016 ES clearly outlined that the assessment of effects was based on the parameters for the assessments and the proposed development presented within Chapter 5: The Proposed Development. The development submitted for approval via the 2019 reserved matters application, as amended, fully accords with the land use and height parameters set by the 2016 outline permission which were assessed as part of the 2016 EIA.

Reserved Matters Proposals

5.3 The 2019 reserved matters application was submitted on 21 October 2019 and the description of development is as follows:

“Reserved matters application proposing details for the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for phase 1 of the leisure development comprising 190 lodges; erection of a new central hub building (providing farm shop, gym, swimming pool, spa, restaurant, cafe, games room, visitor centre, hub management and plant areas); reuse and external alterations to the existing office building to provide housekeeping and maintenance accommodation (including meeting rooms, offices, storage, staff areas and workshop); children's play areas; multi use games area; quarry park; car parking; refuse and lighting arrangements; and managed footpaths, cycleways and bridleways set in attractive hard and soft landscaping.”

5.4 The reserved matters proposals accord with the development thresholds and quantum's set by the 2016 outline planning permission. The proposals are broken down into three areas:

- Hub Area;
- Quarry 1; and
- Quarry 3.

5.5 The Site Masterplan for the 2019 reserved matters application is provided at **Appendix VI**.

Hub Area

5.6 The Hub Area will consist of the following:

- A Hub Building, which will include the following facilities: swimming pool, restaurant/bar, gym, spa and treatment rooms, café, external terrace / seating areas, farm shop, visitor centre and games area. The Hub Building will also accommodate a reception area with associated hub management area, toilets, plant rooms and service area;
- A 106-space car park and 24-space check in car park;
- A Multi Use Games Area (“MUGA”);
- A Children’s Play Area and Adventure Play Area;
- Retention of and external alterations to existing administration building for maintenance and housekeeping facilities. The administration building will include offices, staff meeting rooms, laundry and housekeeping rooms and storage facilities;
- Roads, footpaths and cycleways; and
- Landscaping.

Quarry 1

5.7 Quarry 1 (encompassing the eastern and western lagoon) will consist of:

- 122 lodges;
- A Quarry Park;
- 4 no. natural areas of play;
- Roads, car parking with each lodge, footpaths and cycleways; and
- Landscaping, including extensive enhanced planting to the eastern boundary of the site.

Quarry 3

5.8 Quarry 3 will consist of:

- 68 lodges;
- Roads, car parking with each lodge, footpaths and cycleways;
- A bridge to the south-western corner of the lagoon; and
- Landscaping.

5.9 There have been minor amendments to the reserved matters proposals following comments provided by SMDC during determination. These have been taken into account when preparing this Report and principally relate to updates to the landscaping and relocation of LPG Storage Tanks.

Reserved Matters Planning Conditions

5.10 The 2016 outline planning permission has been subject to a series of conditions attached to the decision notice and Section 106 Agreement. Relevant conditions associated with the 2019 reserved matters application are provided in Table 5.2 below.

5.11 As part of the consented development, there are a series of conditions set out in the decision notice to provide further environmental management measures or information to SMDC to effectively manage any environmental impacts during the construction and operational phases of development. These conditions are discussed in further detail within the relevant technical sections of this Report.

Table 5.2: Reserved Matters Planning Conditions Compliance

No.	Condition Requirements
1	Provision of reserved matters information for each relevant phase.
4	Delivery of the development in accordance with the approved plans and documents.

No.	Condition Requirements
6	Restrictions on the quantum of deliverable development.
9	Provision of ecological and arboriculture assessments.
11	Details in respect of levels and engineering information.
14	Design principles delivered in accordance with LVIA mitigation measures and DAS principles.
27	Foul and surface water drainage information.
41	Provision of an Arboriculture Impact Assessment
44	Details in respect of a Structural Landscape Strategy.

Summary

5.12 In summary, the 2019 reserved matters proposals fully accord with the proposed development which was secured as part of the 2016 outline planning permission, and which were assessed as part of the 2016 EIA. A suite of conditions are being discharged as part of the 2019 reserved matters application, and the environmental management conditions are discussed further within the technical sections of this Report.

6. Planning Policy Context

- 6.1 Since the planning application was approved in October 2016, there have been updates to national planning policy. A review of these updated documents is provided below.

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

- 6.2 The revised National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"), published in June 2019, contains the Government's most up-to-date planning guidance. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of the planning application. The 2019 reserved matters application has been prepared to accord with the most recent version of the Government's policy framework.

Planning Practice Guidance

- 6.3 On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government launched the online Planning Practice Guidance ("PPG") as a web-based resource to further simplify and bring together planning practice guidance for England in an accessible and usable way. The PPG is intended to assist practitioners and provide further guidance on the interpretation of national planning policy within the NPPF. It is therefore a significant material consideration in the determination of the application.
- 6.4 The PPG is regularly revised and updated in line with any amendments to policy and best practice. The 2019 reserved matters application has taken into account any additional relevant guidance presented within this resource.

Local Planning Policy

- 6.5 There have been no amendments to local planning policy since the submission of the 2016 outline application. A new Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan has been prepared which will cover the period 2016 to 2031. The new Local Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation following examination and a main modifications consultation but has not yet been adopted.

Technical Guidance and Legislation

- 6.6 There have been updates to technical guidance and legislation since preparation of the June 2016 ES; however, it is not considered this would require an Addendum to update assessments on this basis. A number of the planning conditions included on the decision notice and mitigation measures presented in the June 2016 ES will ensure that any further or supplementary information provided as part of reserved matters, prior to construction or upon occupation, will meet the latest guidance and required environmental standards.

Summary

- 6.7 In summary, the Supporting Planning Statement (“SPS”) (Avison Young, October 2019,) which has been submitted with the 2019 reserved matters application, provides a robust assessment of the planning application against up-to-date planning policy and guidance. Nonetheless none of the above changes are considered to warrant additional environmental information.

7. Socioeconomics

- 7.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential socioeconomic impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the socioeconomic assessment.
- 7.2 There have been updates to the demographic data used in the 2016 assessment. However, it is not considered the baseline will have shifted significantly to alter the significance of the socio-economic benefits previously identified. There have been no amendments to the proposed development which were assessed and approved as part of the 2016 outline planning permission.
- 7.3 Due to the nature of the proposals the residual effects are less reliant on the socioeconomic baseline, as the effects are primarily derived by the capital expenditure and investment, as a result of the proposals, in the local economy, services and businesses. The investment into the local community and economy remains as presented in the June 2016 ES.
- 7.4 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the socioeconomic effects of the development.

8. Landscape and Visual

- 8.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential landscape and visual impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment ("LVIA").
- 8.2 To ensure a worst-case assessment was undertaken as part of the LVIA, the baseline conditions assumed the full implementation of the Revised Restoration Plan which was approved by Staffordshire County Council ("SCC") (**Appendix V**). This approach ensured that all vegetation and habitat loss as a result of the proposals would be accurately identified and mitigated as part of the EIA.
- 8.3 With regards to the current baseline on site, there have been ongoing restoration works in line with the agreed restoration plan. These have been overseen by Bowland Ecology as part of their ongoing ecological input and advice at the site.
- 8.4 Therefore, a robust baseline assessment was undertaken to inform the EIA. In addition an application has been made to retain the former lab building on site, this has been considered under the cumulative effects section and is not considered to give rise to any change in the baseline for assessing significant environmental effects given that a 'worst case' approach of a restored site has been assumed for the assessment.
- 8.5 Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were ready to progress. There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 12 – The proposed bridleways shall be informed by a construction methodology which takes account of landscape and visual construction and operation management measures.
 - Condition 14 – The reserved matters should be delivered in accordance with the design principles within the DAS and the mitigation measures presented within Table 8,9, Chapter 8 LVIA of the June 2016 ES.
 - Condition 17 – A Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP") should be prepared which incorporates the mitigation measures presented within Table 8,10, Chapter 8 LVIA of the June 2016 ES.
 - Condition 44 – Delivery of a comprehensive Structural Landscape Strategy ("SLS") which builds upon the mitigation and enhancement principles presented within Chapter 8 LVIA of the June 2016 ES.
- 8.6 To supplement the reserved matters application, photomontages have been prepared to illustrate the detailed designs when looking onto the site from the direction of the Listed Buildings at Little Eaves Farm. The location of these viewpoints were agreed with SMDC. The photomontages are provided at **Appendix VII** Due to the robust approach for the LVIA it is not considered there would be any new effects nor a change

to the significance of previously identified effects. The proposals accord with the parameters set by the 2016 outline permission and therefore the residual effects remain as presented in the June 2016 ES.

- 8.7 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the landscape and visual effects of the development.

9. Ecology

- 9.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential ecological impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the ecology assessment.
- 9.2 There has been a wealth of ecological surveys undertaken at the site over a period of ten years which are set out in Table 9.1.

Table 9.1: Schedule of Ecological Surveys, Moneystone Quarry

Time Period	Surveys Undertaken
2010 - 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey; • Hedgerow survey; • National Vegetation Classification; • Reptile Survey; • Amphibian Survey; • Breeding Bird Survey; • Badger Survey Plan; • Riverine Species Survey – otter, water vole, crayfish; and • Bat Surveys – emergence/activity.
2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey; • National Vegetation Classification; • Reptile Survey; • Amphibian Survey; • Breeding Bird Survey; • Badger Survey Plan; • Riverine Species Survey – otter, water vole, crayfish; • Bat Surveys (including Crow Trees Farm); and • Monitoring for management plan including walkover survey.
2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring for management plan including walkover survey.
2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat survey (Phase 1); • Breeding birds; • Bat surveys; • Reptiles; • Amphibians; and • Monitoring for management plan including walkover survey.
2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update walkover survey.
2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update walkover survey.
2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update walkover survey.
2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bat Inspection – Sibelco lab buildings.

- 9.3 To ensure a robust assessment was undertaken, the baseline conditions assessed included the existing baseline at the time the June 2016 ES was prepared, and that of a future baseline once the approved restoration had been implemented.
- 9.4 In addition, Bowland Ecology have reviewed the evidence base and confirmed this provides an accurate and clear understanding of the ecological conditions at the site. Given the wealth of data gathered over the last 10 years, it is not considered necessary to undertake any further ecological surveys. The review and analysis undertaken by Bowland Ecology is presented at **Appendix VIII**.
- 9.5 There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 9 – Provision of an Ecological and Arboricultural assessment if any works are proposed within the area of retained landscape defined by the approved parameters plan.
 - Condition 12 – The proposed bridleways shall be informed by a construction methodology which takes account of ecological management measures.
 - Condition 18 – Provision of a Construction Ecological Management Plan which has been informed by the principles of the outline CEMP provided at Appendix 9.3 of the June 2016 ES.
 - Condition 19 – Provision of a Habitat Management Plan which has been informed by the principles of the outline Habitat Management Plan provided at Appendix 9.4 of the June 2016 ES.
 - Condition 20 – Provision of a sensitive lighting strategy to minimise the impacts on bats.
 - Condition 44 – Delivery of a comprehensive SLS which builds upon the mitigation and enhancement principles presented within Chapter 9 Ecology of the June 2016 ES.
- 9.6 Taking all the above information into account, it is not considered that further baseline information needs to be gathered nor will there be any new effects or change in the significance of effects previously identified. The conditions set out on the decision notice in respect of ecology, combined with the mitigation presented in the June 2016 ES, provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of ecological receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 9.7 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the ecological effects of the development.

10. Archaeology and Heritage

- 10.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential archaeology and heritage impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the archaeology and heritage assessment.
- 10.2 Due to the nature of archaeological and heritage receptors, it is not considered the baseline will have changed since the June 2016 ES was prepared. Any archaeological resources would have remained in-situ and no new heritage assets have been designated which have the potential to be affected by the proposals.
- 10.3 There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 47 – Undertaking an archaeological watching brief, walkover and earthwork survey.
 - Condition 48 – Erection of an interpretation board on the former site of Whiston Eaves Farmhouse and stable block on Whiston Eaves Lane.
- 10.4 The effects on the setting of listed buildings was a principal consideration of the Council and has been carefully reassessed. Accordingly, as set out above, there have been additional photomontages prepared to illustrate views from the Listed Buildings at Little Eaves Farmhouse. However, as the proposals are within the parameters previously assessed it is not considered there would be any new effects as a result of the reserved matters. Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the archaeological and heritage effects of the development.

11. Ground Conditions

- 11.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential ground conditions impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the ground conditions assessment.
- 11.2 There is a wealth of geo-environmental and geotechnical surveys which have been undertaken at the site during and since quarrying operations ceased. These surveys are further supplemented by the quarterly monitoring reports and summarised in Biannual reports which are undertaken by Abbeydale and provided to SCC. These surveys have provided an accurate picture of the geo-environmental and geotechnical conditions which informed the June 2016 ES. It is therefore considered that an accurate and representative understanding of the site's baseline conditions has been prepared which informed the assessment.
- 11.3 Furthermore, there are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 36 – Undertaking a risk assessment associated with contamination.
 - Condition 37 – Preparing a remediation strategy and validation plan.
 - Condition 38 – Preparing a validation report upon completion of the remediation strategy and implementation of the validation plan.
 - Condition 39 – Requirement to cease any site operations if unidentified contamination is identified.
 - Condition 40 – Restricting the importation of material unless it has been suitably tested for contamination and assessed for its suitability for the proposed development.
- 11.4 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration, the quarterly monitoring of the geo-environmental and geotechnical conditions at the site, and the conditions on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the Ground Conditions assessment is considered necessary. The conditions provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 11.5 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the ground condition effects of the development.

12. Drainage and Flood Risk

- 12.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential drainage and flood risk impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the drainage and flood risk assessment.
- 12.2 The June 2016 ES was informed by an FRA, as well as groundwater monitoring data which had been gathered since 2011. Therefore, a robust baseline assessment was undertaken to inform the EIA. Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were ready to progress. A detailed drainage strategy has been prepared by JPG and is submitted with the 2019 reserved matters application. This report intends to discharge the requirements of Condition 27 set out below. There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 27 – Provision of a foul and surface water drainage scheme informed by the detailed designs.
 - Condition 28 – Assessment of surface water flow routes and necessary mitigation measures.
 - Condition 29 – Restriction on works within the vicinity of open watercourses to ensure the maintenance and protection of watercourses and river habitat.
 - Condition 30 – Restriction on the finished floor levels to protect development from overland flow.
- 12.3 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration, the quarterly monitoring of the groundwater at the site, and the conditions on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the drainage and flood risk assessment is considered necessary. The conditions provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 12.4 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the drainage and flood risk effects of the development.

13. Transport and Access

- 13.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential highways impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the highways assessment.
- 13.2 The June 2016 ES was informed by a robust transport assessment with the scope of traffic surveys and information prior agreed with SMDC. Therefore, a robust baseline assessment was undertaken to inform the EIA. It is not considered the baseline has increased materially such that the significance of effects would require reassessment, nor have the proposals been amended to warrant an updated assessment.
- 13.3 Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were ready to progress. Therefore, a series of conditions are attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 16 – Provision of pedestrian and cycling route information.
 - Condition 21 – Detailed designs for highways infrastructure within the site.
 - Condition 22 – Provision of the details for off-site highways improvements at the junction of Whiston Eaves Lane and the A52.
 - Condition 23 – Detailed designs for the principal site access of Eaves Lane.
 - Condition 24 – Provision of a traffic management scheme to reduce speed levels at the junction of Whiston Eaves Lane and the A52.
 - Condition 25 – Preparation of a signage scheme for all traffic entering and exiting the site.
 - Condition 26 – Preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan which implements and expands on the mitigation measures set out within Chapter 13 of the June 2016 ES.
- 13.4 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration and the conditions on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the highways assessment is considered necessary. The detailed designs will also allow a Travel Plan to be prepared and agreed with SMDC. The conditions and measures set out in the June 2016 ES provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 13.5 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the traffic and transportation effects of the development.

14. Air Quality

- 14.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential air quality impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the air quality assessment.
- 14.2 It has not been considered necessary to update the traffic figures within the highways assessment and therefore it is not considered necessary to revisit the air quality assessment submitted with the June 2016 ES. The assessment and mitigation measures presented within the June 2016 ES is considered to remain valid.
- 14.3 Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were ready to progress. There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 17 – Preparation of a CEMP.
 - Condition 46 – Preparation of a Dust Management Plan.
- 14.4 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration and the conditions on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the air quality assessment is considered necessary. The detailed designs will also allow a Travel Plan to be prepared and agreed with SMDC. The conditions and measures set out in the June 2016 ES provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 14.5 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the air quality effects of the development.

Cellarhead Junction

- 14.6 Since the 2016 outline application was approved an ("AQMA") has been designated at the Cellarhead Junction which is located approximately 8km west of the site. The AQMA was designated in July 2019 based upon the potential exceedance of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide ("NO₂") air quality objective. The Cellarhead Junction is the crossroads of the A520 Leek Road (north and south) and A52 Kingsley Road and A52 Cellarhead Road (east and west respectively).
- 14.7 The AQMA was not designated at the time the June 2016 ES was prepared and therefore did not form part of the air quality assessment. As a result, BWB have been commissioned to undertake an air quality assessment at the Cellarhead Junction to determine the likely effects as a result of the proposed development. The assessment is presented at **Appendix IX** and considered the operational phase road traffic emissions at identified receptor locations within the designated AQMA.
- 14.8 The scope and approach to the assessment has been agreed with officers at SMDC.

- 14.9 Four scenarios were considered in the air dispersion modelling:
- Scenario 1: 2018 Verification Year;
 - Scenario 2: 2020 Base Year;
 - Scenario 3: 2022 Opening Year without development; and
 - Scenario 4: 2022 Opening Year with development.
- 14.10 The baseline assessment for Scenario 2: 2020 Base Year and Scenario 3: 2022 Opening Year Without Development, indicates that predicted concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are below the respective annual mean air quality objectives at all receptors, with the exception of R4 and R11 in Scenario 2: 2020 Base Year. These receptors are located at the closest point to the Cellarhead Junction, where queuing traffic occurs.
- 14.11 Concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} were predicted at identified existing receptor locations for Scenario 4: 2022 Opening Year with development, to consider the impact of development-generated vehicles on local air quality within the Cellarhead Junction AQMA.
- 14.12 The predicted NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations for Scenario 3: 2022 Opening Year without development and Scenario 4: 2022 Opening Year with development are below the relevant annual mean air quality objectives for all receptors. The proposed development does not lead to any additional exceedances of the annual mean air quality objectives.
- 14.13 Predicted changes in NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations are all less than 1% of the relevant annual mean air quality objectives and concentration changes are less than 94% of the relevant annual mean objectives. The impact of development-generated traffic within the Cellarhead AQMA is therefore predicted to be negligible in accordance with IAQM and EPUK guidance.
- 14.14 In addition, for robustness, a sensitivity analysis was undertaken which assumed the NO_x concentrations did not decrease in line with projected emission factors. The findings of the sensitivity analysis predicted that the impact of development-generated road traffic on local air quality as negligible to slight adverse in accordance with IAQM and EPUK guidance. Therefore, no significant air quality impacts are anticipated as a result of the sensitivity analysis.

Summary

- 14.15 In summary, an air quality assessment has been undertaken at the Cellarhead Junction. The findings of which confirm that there are no significant effects as a result of the proposed development at this junction and the effects are considered to be negligible. A sensitivity analysis exercise has been undertaken which confirms that potential effects would be negligible to slight adverse, if NO_x emissions were not to decrease in line with projected emission factors. Overall, no significant air quality effects are anticipated at the Cellarhead AQMA and the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the air quality effects of the development.

15. Noise and Vibration

- 15.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential noise and vibration impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the noise and vibration assessment.
- 15.2 It has not been considered necessary to update the traffic figures within the highways assessment and therefore it is not considered necessary to revisit the noise and vibration assessment submitted with the June 2016 ES. The assessment and mitigation measures presented within the June 2016 ES is considered to remain valid.
- 15.3 Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were progressed. There are a series of conditions attached to the 2016 outline planning permission which will require discharging as part of the reserved matters or prior to commencing works on site, including:
- Condition 31 – Preparation of a scheme for the containment of operational noise at the site.
 - Condition 32 – Noise insulation requirements for the lodges.
 - Condition 33 – Restrictions on the amplification of music.
 - Condition 34 – Preparation of a scheme setting out the plant to be installed at the site and any associated noise levels at sensitive receptors.
 - Condition 35 – Preparation of a Construction Environmental Method Statement which includes noise and vibration mitigation measures set out within Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration of the June 2016 ES.
- 15.4 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration and the conditions on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the noise and vibration assessment is considered necessary. The conditions and measures set out in the June 2016 ES provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 15.5 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the noise and vibration effects of the development.

16. Waste

- 16.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the implications, if any, that the details of the reserved matters will have on the submitted June 2016 ES. The Chapter provides a SoC with regard to the potential waste impacts arising from the 2019 reserved matters application. The SoC is provided pursuant to the June 2016 ES to confirm the overall findings with respect to the waste assessment.
- 16.2 It has not been considered necessary to update the waste assessment and the mitigation measures presented within the June 2016 ES are considered to remain valid. Due to the outline nature of the proposals, additional information was required once detailed designs were ready to progress. Due to the nature of waste management this needs to be specifically informed by a detailed Site Waste Management Plan which comprises condition 45 of the 2016 decision notice.
- 16.3 Taking the June 2016 ES into consideration and the condition 25 on the 2016 decision notice, it is not considered any further updates to the waste assessment is considered necessary. The conditions and measures set out in the June 2016 ES provide sufficient environmental management and mitigation measures for the long-term protection of on and off-site receptors during the construction and operational phases of development.
- 16.4 Overall, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid and is adequate to assess the waste effects of the development.

17. Summary and Conclusions

- 17.1 Avison Young has been appointed by Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited to prepare an EIA SoC Report to support the 2019 reserved matters application at Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire.
- 17.2 The 2016 outline application was supported by the June 2016 ES which comprised a comprehensive suite of technical assessments to establish the environmental impacts of the proposed development. The June 2016 ES identified a series of robust environmental management and mitigation measures which informed a series of conditions to provide additional information once the reserved matters applications have progressed or prior to commencing works on site.
- 17.3 The 2019 reserved matters application, as amended, comprises proposals which are wholly within the defined assessment parameters which formed the assessments within the June 2016 ES. Therefore, it is considered that the June 2016 ES remains valid for the purposes of decision making.
- 17.4 Bowland Ecology have undertaken a review of the evidence base prepared to date and confirmed that, due to the wealth of data available, this is robust and reflective of the site conditions. There are not anticipated to be any new effects nor is the significance of previously identified effects anticipated to change.
- 17.5 BWB have undertaken a review of the traffic related air quality impacts at the newly designated AQMA for the Cellarhead Junction. The conclusions of this assessment confirm the proposals are not anticipated to result in significant air quality impacts as a result of the proposed development.
- 17.6 In summary, the June 2016 ES is considered to be valid for the purposes of decision making in respect of the 2019 reserved matters application, and no new significant environmental impacts have been identified which would warrant the provision of a direction under regulation 25. Appropriate information has been provided to the Council (and appended) to confirm these findings. Therefore, it is considered that Regulation 9(2) of the 2017 EIA Regulations is satisfied as the environmental information before SMDC is adequate to assess the significant effects of the development on the environment, and further environmental information is therefore not warranted.

Appendix I

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) - Site Location Plan

Appendix II

2019 Reserved Matters Application (ref. SMD/2019/0646) – Site Location Plan

Appendix III

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Parameters Plan

Appendix IV

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Eaves Lane Access Plan

Appendix V

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Restoration Plan

Appendix VI

2019 Reserved Matters Application (ref. SMD/2019/0646) – Site Masterplan

Appendix VII

Photomontages – Planit-ie

Appendix VIII

Ecological Baseline Review – Bowland Ecology

Appendix IX

Air Quality Assessment: Cellarhead Junction – BWB

Contact Details

Enquiries

Jamie Lynch

0161 834 7187

jamie.lynch@avisonyoung.com

Visit us online

www.avisonyoung.co.uk