

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

AT A MEETING of the **Planning Committee** held at the County Hall, Durham on **Wednesday 15 October 2008 at 10.30 a.m.**

PRESENT

COUNCILLOR RODGERS* in the Chair

Members:

Councillors Bainbridge B*, Bell A*, Boyes D*, Burnip R*, Cordon J*, Davidson K*, Dixon M* Farry D*, Hollroyd K*, Liddle R, Maddison D*, Naylor A*, O'Donnell L, Plews M*, Richardson G*, Taylor P*, Temple O*, Turner Allen*, Walker C*, Williams M,* and Young R*.

Other Members:

Councillors Avery B*, Brown D and Robinson J and Young B

Members shown with an asterisk* attended the site visit to Thrislington Quarry

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillors Alderson, Armstrong, Holland, Myers, Potts, Stoker,

A1 Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held 20 August 2008 were confirmed by the Committee as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the meetings held 20 August 2008 were confirmed by the Committee as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Head of Environment and Planning informed Members that a meeting had been held with Newfield residents, Local Members and officers in respect of the composting at the former Scoby Scaur site.

A2 Applications to be determined by the County Council

Sedgefield Borough: Proposed eastern extension for the extraction of magnesian limestone and restoration to nature conservation uses at Thrislington Quarry, West Cornforth for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd

The Head of Environment and Planning presented a report on the application (for copy see file of Minutes). He informed the Committee that a further 16 letters of support for the application had been received from employees and associated companies. One supplementary letter of objection had also been received.

He also advised the Committee that in respect of paragraph 161 there had been 3 accidents in the last 10 years at the Cross Lane / A177 Junction.

The Chairman informed the Committee that a number of people had requested permission to speak at the meeting and that he had agreed to these requests. He clarified to the meeting who would be speaking in what order and this was agreed.

Mr King, a resident of Highland Farm Cottages informed the meeting that he and his wife had lived at the cottage for 14 years and they enjoyed the peace, tranquillity and outstanding beauty of the area and explained that it would be a tragedy for future generations of County Durham residents if it were destroyed. This was rural land dedicated to quality agriculture as it had been for centuries. He described the disruption of the natural landscape that would be caused by ugly mounds and the scarring from immensely noisy earth moving machines which would mean all the beautiful views to the north would be destroyed and the land cut off from the beautiful area to the south. He also said that the material quarried was not for use in Durham.

He told the committee that his family had been farmers in County Durham for generations and described how they understood the natural cycle of the seasons and the land. This area was quality agricultural land which is an extremely valuable source of food which the country may well have to depend upon in the future. With the availability of good quality agricultural land shrinking we should think long and hard before destroying forever such an important asset to this county and country. Ugly scarred landscapes will destroy communities and who would want a return to the days of slag heaps dominating their village or the dust that hung over Consett from the steel works. Such a development would deter visitors and it was unlikely young families, the lifeblood of a community, would move in and those already there would seek to move away. Our pleasant and peaceful community will be destroyed.

He then referred to the abundant wildlife in the locality and described how everyday from his home he had been privileged to watch wild animals such as foxes, rabbits, hares, partridge, pheasants and deer. Rare birds such as the bee-eater were on the land where they had become celebrities on local

television. The proposal would render the area sterile for wildlife. He then raised concern about the unlimited dust created during the course of working the existing quarry and said that this would continue in the new quarry and make life unbearable for them and their neighbours. He concluded by saying that everyone in the room today cared about County Durham and its residents and this quarry extension would be a blight on the county's beautiful countryside for generations to come.

Ms Ferguson of George F White told the meeting that she was speaking as a representative of the Hirst Family who own some of the farmland (21 ha freehold / 27ha tenancy and own property affected by the development) and as such were concerned about the effects on their livelihood as well as the impact on the locality. The proposal would result in a loss of 50 hectares of their landholding and would have a significant effect on their livelihood. The family also had concerns over the long term management of the site and they were unaware of any legal agreements in connection with the land and as such they had always disputed the applicant's proposals. The Hirst family asked for the matter to be deferred until these issues are resolved. If approved a legally enforceable agreement should be in place to ensure restoration.

Mr Finch of Dickinson Dees informed the meeting he was representing the interests of the Marshall family. He wanted to emphasise one key point concerning the restoration process. The family owns 67 acres of the surface land included in the application on a freehold basis. Lafarge has mineral rights to access the land (through a lease with the Church Commissioners) and once exercised they revert to the landowner. Lafarge has no rights once extraction ceases. There are two consequences of the proposal. Lafarge cannot guarantee the restoration of the site cannot enter into a legal agreement for restoration and aftercare. The land is best and most versatile and once lost the land cannot be got back as it cannot be restored to its current condition.

The report in Paragraph 69 refers to Policy M56 which allows for the extension to the quarry to be permitted provided that a programme of progressive restoration for the area to include open recreation, nature conservation and agricultural use is agreed and he asked if it was possible to achieve this. He then referred to the consultation with Natural England starting at Paragraph 30 in the report. They had not objected on the basis of certain assumptions one of which was the DCC was satisfied that the development and reclamation scheme conformed to certain criteria as listed in the report. As these were not achievable it cannot be said that it was in agreement with the proposal. In Paragraph 31 Natural England assumes that DCC would seek to ensure that adequate financial provision or other agreements were in place for the restoration of the site and its subsequent aftercare management. They did not object on the basis of this assumption and this was incorrect. Restoration and aftercare is forever and if Members are not satisfied this can be achieved then the Authority should be careful of entering into such as agreement. Restoration and aftercare is a major

consideration and must be supported financially and there is no evidence as to how this will be funded.

Mr Lee, a resident of Bishop Middleham, said that he had lived in County Durham all his life and believed it was the best place to live and work. Bishop Middleham is a great community and is a safe place to live. He referred to Durham County Council's mission statement to make County Durham the best place in which to live, work and bring up a family and he believed the County Council was doing a grand job. As a family they do not want this change. Footpath 23 was the only footpath between Bishop Middleham and West Cornforth and there was an abundance of wildlife in the area including deer. If this quarry goes ahead then this would be lost. When using footpath 21/22 there is nothing to be seen except views of heaps and the constant drone from the motorway. The road between Bishop Middleham and Hope House is in poor condition and is covered in dirt from the site and is a breach of the conditions attached to the permission. He is constantly ringing HAL to report the poor state of the road. If you walk along this route the dolomite sticks to your shoes and locally it is known as the yellow brick road. The company say their vehicles use the wheel wash but this a home made affair and is not operating correctly. Their road sweeper machine is rarely in fully working order and he has reported this to both HAL and the police and they have spoken to Lafarge on this issue. Lafarge has no interest in the local community and are just interested in the bottom line.

Mr Potts, a resident of Bishop Middleham firstly queried the need for a new quarry and produced evidence to show that no case had been made for the new quarry's products. This included statements from the North East Assembly Development Board and figures showing that steel production in the United Kingdom had significantly reduced due to the closure of Ravenscraig in Scotland and Llanwern in Wales. In addition the Head of Corus declared Teesside's Redcar plant as surplus to his company's internal requirements. Capacity has been removed and therefore the need for dolomite has slumped significantly from 492,000 tonnes in 1998 to around 260/270,000 tonnes today. Greater efficiency within the industry has also meant that dolomite consumption per tonne of steel produced had reduced from 25kg in 1997 to 18 kg in 2005. He therefore believed that no need for the dolomite had been shown. The steel industry has collapsed to such an extent that output in 2007 is still below that in 2000. Demand for dolomite has therefore declined and the overseas markets now account for 40% of production. Lafarge do not market any products for the steel industry. Its strength is in cement, aggregates and roof tiles production so are not well placed to claim that there are no alternatives to the proposed development. And that not working the Eastern Extension would result in quarry and plant closure with knock on effects to the steel industry in the United Kingdom.

For the size of its economy and population the UK has the smallest steel industry in Western Europe and it is not going to grow miraculously and use more calcined dolomite as the capacity has been removed. Steetley export to secure sales so why should South Durham have to bear the burden of this

policy. Mr Potts moved on to economic regeneration and informed the meeting that this would come about if a better educated population are in a position to exploit new opportunities in “high tech” industries. Relying on obsolete, declining activities which are of no interest to a population with aspirations is a policy of despair. He explained the % of Gross Domestic Product differentials of Tees Valley and Durham compared to other areas in Europe and elsewhere in England. He also informed the Committee that Sedgefield Borough Council stated in “Inform” in February 2007 that the next stage for Netpark was approved and how this would contribute to the economic regeneration of the area. He said that quarrying would not contribute to an economy based on high end computing, microprocessors, biotechnology and material science. Imposing quarrying on an area struggling to recover from exhausted mining operations is not a good policy. The intrusion of the proposal in the landscape would be negative and full-time, pensionable jobs in the quarry are not going to increase over the next 30 years.

Mr Potts concluded by informing the meeting that research and development will be a key driver of UK prosperity in the decades ahead. Without it our industries won't be able to compete with the growing economic powers of South East Asia. Steetley Dolomite's Annual Report and Accounts in 2007 carried no specific information on any Research and Development spend. He queried whether they had an R&D spend how much the spend was and whether any was budgeted for this year at Thrislington. He also queried the inclusion of any spending on R&D at Thrislington with a view to investigating and mitigating the production of CO2 in the process plants at Thrislington. He also thought that the proposals would contribute little to the balance of payments.

Mr Lambert, a resident of Mainsforth, Ferryhill informed the meeting that he was a Project Manager with a company who had recently been commissioned to invest millions of pounds in agricultural land in Durham. NEA were seriously concerned about the loss of a large quantity (200 acres) of good quality agricultural land and he advised that the sustainability of prime agricultural land must take precedence. Farming is in crisis but only in Britain as European farming including Ireland is successful. Eventually the UK will have to turn back and develop it's farming and that is why the Government is investing in Companies like his.

A lot of Lafrage's assumptions and forecasts are out of date or unsubstantiated and now is not the time to lose prime agricultural land and make this irreversible decision. He quoted from a David Milliband speech which stated that farming matters and it is important for the whole country. Farmers are on the frontline and land is essential for a sustainable future and we must live within the needs of the planet.

Councillor Wiffen, Bishop Middleham Parish Councillor and resident of Bishop Middleham and member of Stop Lafarge Action Group (SLAG) told the Committee that he had resided in the area for 41 years living under a cloud of

dust. This would condemn them to more of the same for a further 32 years. The site would leave them with barren fields and a hedge but the grade 2 agricultural land would be gone to be replaced by sterile soil. How can you place a value on the landscape. The officer's report is littered with unfortunies such as, 'reasonable', 'don't think' 'not likely to have' 'anticipate' and these are guesses not facts.

The map provided by Lafarge appears to be detailed but omits several features – it does not show the footpath they will erase, it does not show Bishop Middleham quarry, it does not show the currently dormant West Cornforth quarry or the SSSI site. On the map circulated today is the Tarmac quarry which although currently closed can be re-opened with mining going on until 2042. All the lorries will come out of the site onto Stobbs Cross Lane that will be 230 per day added to the 250 per day from Thrislington entrance 2. He did not think that the road and junction could cope. Thompson's quarry was scheduled to close in 2015 but an application will be coming to extend the life of this quarry.

He considered that the bio-diversity report prepared by Lafarge is very poor. There are very many rare listed birds recorded on this land such as the corn bunting and 1/6 of the County's population can be found on this land. Brown hares and bats also forage the area and they cannot do this in a quarry. The report states that it does not think the proposal will lead to unacceptable levels of traffic. This is a dangerous junction where slow wagons will be entering a fast flowing road. The study undertaken makes no reference to the effects should the Tarmac quarry be re-opened in the future. This is a very congested area. The Highways Agency weren't confident about the information provided by Lafarge that it had to do its own survey. He concluded by referring to effects of the dust from the quarry works and the effects of these and CO2 emissions on the lungs. Whilst there are figures for vehicles leaving from entrance number 2 there is no indication as to how many vehicles leave entrance number 1. He reminded the Committee that this was the Land of the Prince Bishops not the Land of Lafarge.

Councillor Muncaster, a resident and Parish Councillor for Bishop Middleham informed the meeting he had been in the locality for 12 years and that his wife's family had always lived in the area. As vice-chairman of Bishop Middleham Parish Council he had always tried to take a measured view on all matters. On this occasion he had concerns that there was not enough specialist information on which to make a decision for the next 32 years. He then continued by bringing the Committee's attention to the following issues in the report.

Paragraph 18 refers to 'certainty of supply' to the works and hence the steel industry, but the contribution of the Whitwell site is completely ignored in this respect and the fact is that the majority of the material produced is exported.

Referring to paragraph 38/39 Councillor Muncaster informed the Committee that the Environment Agency originally objected to the proposal and having

spoken to them they still had strong concerns and they were not sure if the measures were secure. He asked if the County Council was willing to risk thousands of people's water supply.

Paragraphs 56/57 refer to the need for the material that is produced but does not mention that Whitwell, Derbyshire can provide the required material for the next 20 years and it is a fact that 40% of the produced material was exported by SDL. The MLP states that need must be proved and this is not the case.

Paragraph 89 states that Corus was sold to Tata in 2007 and that whilst Tata's future plans are unknown Lafarge 'believes' this is a positive step for the steel industry. Lafarge would believe this given that they have a vested interest but there are no hard facts to support this belief.

Paragraph 116 refers to fissures that have appeared at Highland House Farm and states that it is unlikely to have been caused by the existing operations at Thrislington Quarry as vibration levels are nowhere near those required to dislodge fill material. But there is no evidence to support this claim. The levels are measured at the surface but fault lines will already exist and any shockwaves from the blast will clearly follow the easiest route. An independent professional investigation on this matter is essential.

Paragraph 169 talks about the liaison group. In reality he has only recently received the first letter in over a year. He asked three questions at the meeting and was asked to put them in writing. Lafarge is not pro-active in this issue but re-active and issues were not addressed until closure was threatened.

Councillor Muncaster was unable to complete his presentation as his allocated time was used.

Councillor Brimm of Sedgefield Borough Council and a resident of Bishop Middleham asked that the DVD provided by Mr Potts be shown in his time period. The DVD was shown but there were I.T. difficulties towards the end of the film which meant that it could not be shown in its entirety. Councillor Brimm declined to make any further comment at that time.

Councillor Avery, Local Member told the Committee that he had lived in the locality for 50 years and had suffered the effects of wagons, dust and noise in Ferryhill Station for many years. He has listened to the residents of West Cornforth who have suffered from blasting, the loss of wildlife and wagon pollution for many years. He also believed that entry points onto the main roads were very hazardous. He also had concerns that the proposal involved going underneath the water table and the potential effects that this may have on the water supply to Hartlepool especially given the lack of investigation on this issue. The residents of West Cornforth are very tired of the effects caused by the existence of these quarry works including the piling of finds around the chimney and dust on trees and he asked the Committee to consider their decision very carefully.

Councillor Brown, Local Member for Sedgefield congratulated the officers on a comprehensive report. Paragraph 91 says that the Company believes there to be a continuing market for its products. However, 12 days ago the world changed and this report makes a lot of assumptions and they could not have forecast the recession the world now finds itself facing. There are a great number of objections that have been received from many different people and groups and he reminded Members that in 6 months time Durham County would be a unitary authority and this would be a good test to see if it was prepared to listen to the people.

Mr Cromie, representing Lafarge, told the Meeting that he had worked with Lafarge on various aspects of the development of Thrislington Quarry since 2002. The Company welcomed the recommendation of officers that planning permission be approved for the Eastern Extension to the quarry. The report is thorough, reflecting the professionalism of the officers and the extensive consultations that have been carried out. If the application is approved this would secure supplies of nationally important minerals to Thrislington Works and in turn the UK steel industry; and it would secure jobs – over 100 direct employees at the quarry and the Works and many more that are supported by the site's operations. As noted in the Committee Report these are local jobs.

The application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless there are exceptional circumstances that dictate otherwise. The Minerals Local Plan allocates the site for extraction, stating that Thrislington Quarry is one of only two sites in Great Britain that can supply the quality of limestone needed by the steel industry – the other being Whitwell Quarry in Derbyshire. It goes on to state that 'The operations at Thrislington are well established and provide benefits directly and indirectly to the local economy.' The Minerals Local Plan takes forward many of the principles established in the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment Local Plan which was adopted back in 1987 and which had identified the land east of the existing quarry for potential future development and had protected that land from development that would sterilise the resource. The Minerals Plan does indicate that an extension to the south of the existing quarry should be pursued first but the quality of the mineral in the existing quarry is declining and so Lafarge has confirmed that it does not wish to progress this extension and this would be achieved through a legal agreement. In securing this agreement, instead of substantially according with the Development Plan as recognised in the Committee Report, the proposals would fully accord. Lafarge has further committed to relinquish the existing planning permission covering Rough Furze, again to the south of the existing quarry, which is of nature conservation interest. This is again consistent with the Minerals Local Plan.

Lafarge recognises that there are concerns about the extension and so the Company has sought to work with the Council and consultees to ensure that the working would proceed within the environmental limits prescribed by policy. The success in achieving this is borne out by the fact that there are no remaining objections from many key consultees:

Natural England welcomes the proposals to enhance the ecology of the site through restoration and is satisfied with the proposals to manage soils. Lafarge propose to create of 44.5 ha of magnesian limestone grassland through quarry restoration which is a priority habitat in Durham and the north east region.

The Environment Agency is satisfied with the proposals to manage water to ensure that there will be no impacts on groundwater and public water supplies. Lafarge has prepared a detailed strategy for water management and the techniques proposed have been successfully trialed to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency.

The Highways Agency is satisfied that traffic levels can be accommodated in the road network. In the short term it is proposed that traffic levels will not increase above those already permitted on Stobb Cross Lane and when the existing quarry ceases extraction in 2015, traffic levels will reduce to around half the currently permitted daily levels. Minerals to be used in the kilns will be transported to the Works via a tunnel under the A1(M) and Lafarge has an Approval in Principle for the development of the tunnel from the Highways Agency. The rail link at Thrislington Works will continue to be used to transport a significant proportion of the processed stone to the steel industry;

Technical officers within the County Council responsible for landscape and visual impacts, archaeology, ecology and traffic are satisfied with the proposals and the measures designed to protect the local community. The initial phases of quarry working would involve the creation of a landscaping bund around the site which has been designed in consultation with the County's landscape architect. Once constructed this would help to minimise impacts on local amenity and the Environmental Health Officer at Sedgfield Council is satisfied that the proposals will not create unacceptable impacts in terms of noise, dust or blast vibration. Detailed monitoring proposals have been prepared for noise and blast vibration and dust will be dealt with at source using well established best practice. Sedgfield Council recommended amendments to the proposed working hours during the creation of the perimeter landscaping bunds that were agreed by Lafarge.

These measures form part of an environmental package that will ensure that the quarry is worked in a manner that minimises environmental effects, consistent with national, regional and local planning policy. The proposed restoration has been designed in consultation with the County Council and Natural England and provides for substantial ecological enhancement. The target habitat is magnesian limestone grassland and the restoration proposals both for the existing site and the Eastern Extension have the objective of creating over 140 ha of new grassland. This will build upon the success of the Thrislington Plantation National Nature Reserve, which is managed by Lafarge and Natural England, which is of national and international nature conservation importance. Lafarge has also proposed to create similar new grassland in what was the Southern Preferred Area. Lafarge has agreed to

an extended management period to ensure that the site restoration will be successfully implemented. There have been concerns raised about land ownership and how this may impact on quarry development and restoration.

The Church Commissioners formerly owned all of the land and minerals. They sold parts of the surface ownership, but retained the minerals and all the necessary rights to work them. These rights include provision to compensate surface owners whilst the land is being used by Lafarge. Lafarge has a long-term lease with the Church Commissioners. This means that Lafarge and the Church Commissioners will be able to complete any planning agreement required in association with the planning permission. Lafarge has further indicated that they would enter into a legal agreement under the Wildlife and Countryside Act for after-use management over all of the areas that it controls and owns, including land west of the A1(M).

Finally, at the heart of the proposals is an environmental monitoring strategy that would form part of any planning permission or legal agreement. This provides checks and balances throughout the development period and there are proposals for reporting to the County Council to ensure that the development is proceeding as planned. Lafarge would also continue to facilitate the existing local liaison group which provides a forum for exchanging views on the development of the quarry. In conclusion, Lafarge commends the Committee Report and the recommendation of the Officers.

Councillor Robinson, Local Member for Sedgfield, commended the work done by officers in compiling the report but stated that he was not convinced by the arguments and local councils, and most local people had objections to the proposal. He expressed concerns that no conditions were attached to the report. Previously in the 1990's they were told that the site would be completed and restoration works would be carried out in 2015. This has now been extended to 2047 and he asked how he was expected to explain this to local residents. The proposal will lead to more heavy traffic at the site raising residents concerns over mud on the roads.

Paragraphs 38 & 39 raise the issue of the migration of landfill gas in the future but does not detail how this will be dealt with should it occur.

Paragraph 44 County Durham Development Company refers to the issue of blasting and air quality and they believe there should be no significant effects upon residents and other activities further than 500 metres away. That is alright for them but what about the residents who live within the 500 metres zone.

This is an important decision involving our children's future as almost certainly 80% of those present in the room today will not be around in 2042. 32 years is a long time and he was opposed to the scheme.

Councillor O'Donnell said that he had listened carefully to the arguments from both sides and that as always there was a familiar pattern in extensions to

such planning applications. Members are elected to represent the people of County Durham and to work towards the County mission statement. We are presently active in seeking ways to regenerate the County and bring business in to give the people of County Durham a better future. We have heard statements concerning the aquifer and how supplies of water to the east of the county may be affected. The Environment Agency said this is protected and we have to believe them. We have heard representations about the loss of arable land but we have many acres set aside for agriculture.

The economic viability of Durham County is essential to the future of our children. Jobless figures are rising and here we have the opportunity to protect 100 local jobs and he hoped that the Committee did not vote against the recommendation.

Councillor Dixon said that he had heard the arguments and considered the conflicting interests and needs of those involved. The works were already in place and restoration would be taking place whereas the opposite view is that the works should be shut down. However, he believed that we have to consider the economic situation and the potential loss of 100 jobs so he would be voting in favour of the recommendation.

Councillor Richardson said that he had to defend the agriculture argument and referred to Councillor O'Donnell's statement that arable land had been 'set aside' for agriculture but the reality was that 'set aside' does not exist. The facts are that we need to think about the future food production for this country's needs and this land would produce over 1000 tonnes of wheat that would fill this Council Chamber many times over. He would be voting against the recommendation.

Councillor Burnip told the Meeting that he knew what it was like to grow up in an industrial area and where the colliery once stood at Easington Village there was now an area of green grass and it was lovely. However, West Durham was a deprived area and needed these jobs and he would be supporting the recommendation.

Councillor Farry said that this had been a good debate and that there were many objections to the proposal. He stated that the communities of West Cornforth and Ferryhill are very poor areas which are looking to be regenerated. This quarry will move towards Bishop Middleham and the effect of this will hit them also. House prices will fall and people will leave, leaving a blight area behind. All the other local bodies and groups were against the application and there was not one person from the locality that supported the application. He would vote against the recommendation and asked other Members to do likewise.

Councillor Temple accepted that this was a difficult decision requiring the need to balance the economic needs of people against the standard of life for local people and the effects of the proposal on them. He noted that 16 people had written supporting the application.

He would like clarity from the officers regarding the danger of legal challenge to Durham County Council over the freehold position.

The Head of Environment and Planning replied that a draft legal agreement had been produced which Durham County Council's solicitor is satisfied is legal. Mr Cromie also explained that Lafarge and the Church Commissioners

have access to the surface and the site in conjunction with a restoration agreement.

The Acting Director of Corporate Services confirmed that the restoration agreement has been written and that it was acceptable to Lafarge.

Councillor Farry queried that one of the farmers has the freehold to the land but whilst Lafarge would have to restore the land it would not be to arable land. The Head of Environment and Planning confirmed that it would not be restored to arable use.

Councillor Plews said that whilst it would be unfortunate to lose 100 jobs we need to consider that worklessness also comes from a lack of health and we must bear in mind that there is a health issue to consider for local residents and asked how many people's health would be affected.

Councillor Davidson reminded the Committee that their decision must be made on planning grounds and taking into account planning policies. As the appropriate policies were in place he would be supporting the recommendation and noted that the proposal was a minor departure from policy.

Resolved:

That following the result of a vote by 12 votes to 5 planning permission be granted for the proposed eastern extension to Thrislington Quarry, subject to appropriate controlling conditions and the completion of appropriate legal agreements, for the following reasons:

- i) The site is allocated in MLP Policy M56 for the extraction of high grade dolomite for which there is a continuing economic need and the primary purpose of the development would be to extract and process this material for high grade use.
- ii) The impacts of the development, including cumulative, would not be significantly detrimental to the appearance of the area or to residential amenity and wider environmental concerns and can be adequately controlled through conditions in accordance with MLP Policies M36 and M45.
- iii) The renouncing of rights to work Rough Furze Quarry together with its long term management would conserve an existing site of high nature

conservation value and no working of the allocated southern preferred area would provide an opportunity for the creation of a new area of nature conservation interest in line with MLP Policies M29 and M47.

A3 Applications for Planning Permission: Decisions made using Delegated Powers (April 2008 – September 2008)

The Committee noted recent decisions relating to planning applications which have been received in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and determined under the delegated powers procedure (for copy see file of Minutes).