



**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors T R Ashton (Vice-Chairman), D Brailsford, L A Cawrey, Mrs P Cooper, D McNally, Mrs A M Newton, Mrs M J Overton MBE, N H Pepper, R P H Reid, R A Renshaw, S P Roe and P A Skinner

Councillors A P Maughan and R Wootten attended the meeting and spoke (minute 35)

Officers in attendance:-

Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer), Jeanne Gibson (Programme Leader: Minor Works and Traffic), Neil McBride (Head of Planning), Jamie Parsons (Solicitor) and Marc Willis (Applications Team Manager)

27 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Spratt and M J Storer.

It was reported that the Chief Executive under the Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, had appointed Councillor R A Renshaw to the Committee, in place of Councillor Mrs J E Killey, until further notice.

28 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor S Roe requested that a note should be in the minutes that he was approached by the local MP for Sleaford and North Hykeham, Dr Caroline Johnson, during the site visit but had not discussed the application with her and had informed her that he was a member of the Planning and Regulation Committee site visit (minute 35).

Councillor L A Cawrey requested that a note should be in the minutes that she was approached by the local MP for Sleaford and North Hykeham, Dr Caroline Johnson, during the site visit but had not discussed the application with her and had informed her that she was a member of the Planning and Regulation Committee site visit (minute 35).

Councillor I G Fleetwood requested that a note should be made in the minutes that Councillor R Wootten had introduced him to the local MP for Sleaford and North Hykeham, Dr Caroline Johnson, during the site visit, that he had not discussed the application with her but had overheard her make various statements to the planning officer (minute 35).

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020**

Councillor R P H Reid requested that a note should be made in the minutes that he was the portfolio holder for planning at South Kesteven District Council (minute 35).

- 29 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND
REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2020

RESOLVED (10 votes for, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions)

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 7 September 2020, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

- 30 MINUTES OF THE SITE VISIT TO LAND WEST OF ROOKERY LANE,
SUDBROOK HELD ON 28 SEPTEMBER 2020

(Note: Only those Members who had attended the site visit on 28 September 2020, were allowed to speak and vote on this matter – Councillors T R Ashton, L A Cawrey, P Cooper, I G Fleetwood, D McNally, Mrs A M Newton, N H Pepper, R Renshaw and S P Roe)

RESOLVED (8 votes for, 0 votes against and 4 abstentions)

That the minutes of the site visit held on 28 September 2020, be agreed and noted.

- 31 TRAFFIC ITEMS

- 32 A151 MOULTON - WESTON - PROPOSED 40 AND 50MPH SPEED
LIMITS

The Committee received a report in connection with the introduction of speed limit reductions along the A151 through the villages of Moulton and Weston, in the area shown at Appendix B of the report. Investigations had indicated that this site might be considered a 'Borderline Case', as defined within the Council's Speed Limit Policy.

The Chairman informed the meeting that Councillor E J Poll, the local Member, supported the proposals in the report.

On a motion by Councillor N H Pepper, seconded by Councillor I G Fleetwood, it was

–

RESOLVED (12 votes for, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions)

That the proposed speed limits as detailed in the report be approved to enable the necessary consultation process to bring them into effect may be pursued.

- 33 A15, SLEAFORD TO LEASINGHAM - PROPOSED 50MPH SPEED LIMIT

The Committee received a report in connection with a request from the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership for the introduction of a new 50mph speed limit on the A15, from Holdingham roundabout northwards to include the two junctions into Leasingham. Investigations had indicated that this site might be considered a 'Borderline Case', as defined within the Council's Speed Limit Policy.

Comments by Members included:-

- The local highway signs were obscured by overgrown vegetation on the A15 towards Lincoln.
- Consideration of the proposals should be deferred until the impact of the highway works at Holdingham roundabout were known. Officers stated that the completion of the highway works at Holdingham roundabout were unknown and if they were completed the proposals in the report were still applicable.
- The proposals were support on highway safety grounds.

RESOLVED (11 votes for, 0 votes against and 1 abstention)

That the proposed speed limit as detailed in the report be approved to enable the necessary consultation process to bring it into effect may be pursued.

34 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

**35 APPLICATION FOR THE DETERMINATION OF UPDATED CONDITIONS
FOR PLANNING PERMISSION WK1139 AND WK4645 AT SUDBROOK
QUARRY, LAND WEST OF ROOKERY LANE, SUDBROOK - LANDESIGN
PLANNING AND LANDSCAPE - S19/1244**

Since the publication of the report and following the circulation of the Committee's Update, officers reported that additional comments had been received from a group of local residents which had been circulated direct to members of the Committee before the meeting. A letter had also been received from the applicant in response to those comments over the weekend. These additional comments/responses had been placed on the Council's website and were viewable by the public.

Officers responded to the additional comments from both the residents and applicant (received on 2 October and 3 October, respectively) verbally during the meeting with the following advice:-

Residents' Comments	Officer's Response
Condition 3 - Resubmission of all drawings with the exception of Location plan and site boundary to reflect the opinion of the applicant's consultant that the proposed scheme	No change necessary. The proposed working scheme and depth of working are feasible and deliverable using the plant/equipment identified. See

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020

<p>of working is unachievable unless fundamentally modified. The necessary modifications are yet to be incorporated in to the scheme of working.</p>	<p>supplementary letter from Touchstone dated 3 October 2020</p>
<p>Condition 4 - As Above. Section 10 of the Environmental Statement is not deliverable using proposed method as confirmed by Touchstone Report.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Condition 7 - Max depth shall not exceed 7m unless points 3 and 4 are addressed.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Condition 10 – Request a reptile survey is completed as well as great crested newt.</p>	<p>An Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey was carried out and concluded that the site is of very limited value for reptiles, consisting largely of an arable field, with few areas suitable for basking, hibernating and foraging. A full set of reptile surveys was not therefore considered necessary and no objections have been received from Lincs Wildlife Trust or Natural England. It is not clear where the photos were taken or how these relate to the site however, in order to manage any residual risk to reptiles precautionary site clearance methods could be adopted whilst clearing the site. To secure this it is recommended that Condition 10 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Prior to any vegetation clearance or stripping of soils taking place within each phase of the development, an updated pre-construction Great Crest Newt and Reptile survey shall be carried out and the results submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority. In the event that reptiles or great crested newts are found to be present, then no works shall</p>

	<p>take place until a detailed method statement including details of the measures to be adopted to displace and protect such species from the works has first been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.</p>
<p>Condition 12 -To comply with Environment Agency advice and to ensure protection of local water bodies, ground water monitoring should be for 12 months and should include a ground water balance assessment</p>	<p>Condition 12 will secure a scheme for monitoring any impacts on groundwater and therefore secure the protections recommended. The Agency has agreed that the historical groundwater level data contained in the Environmental Statement (ES) is accurate and that this is corroborated by the level of water in the small pond to the north-east (which is considered to be in hydraulic continuity to the groundwater. Given this your Officers view is 12 months would be excessive and 3 months would be reasonable when taking into account the information and finding of the assessment contained in the ES.</p>
<p>Condition 19 - Operations to cease at 18.00</p>	<p>No change proposed as no evidence to support or justify a reduction to the normal operating times applied to other mineral sites within the County (e.g. noise levels are all within acceptable limits for time of day, etc)</p>
<p>Condition 22 - The Highways Conditions do not adequately meet road safety standards and we request further concessions are made e.g. provision of a footpath and cycle path.</p>	<p>No change proposed. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the provision of two passing places along Rookery Lane would be sufficient and that suitable visibility and clearance can be achieved. It would be unreasonable and unjustified to require the applicant to carry out any improvements above and beyond those proposed given the scale of the impact from this development.</p>
<p>Condition 35 - A baseline dust</p>	<p>The applicant is already carrying out</p>

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020

assessment needs to be submitted to the MPA and trigger points for additional suppression measures or cessation of work to be agreed	<p>baseline dust monitoring on-site and a condition requires the submission of a Dust Management Plan to be submitted for approval. This condition as drafted does not include reference to the need to establish a baseline and identify trigger points but this can be included with a slight amendment to the condition. Recommended that Condition 35 therefore be amended to reflect and to read as follows:</p> <p>No winning and working of mineral shall take place until a scheme and programme of measures for the suppression of dust has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based upon the operational mitigation measures and practices as set out within the Dust Management Plan (contained within Schedule 4 of Appendix B of the Environmental Statement) and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) a description of the baseline conditions and levels experienced around the site;(ii) identify the measures to be employed to suppress dust caused by the moving, processing and storage of soil, overburden, stone and other materials within the site;(iii) include details of the dust suppression measures to be applied on haul roads, including speed limits;(iv) include details of the measures to be adopted for monitoring dust levels from the site including the location and type of any dust monitoring points and a scheme for the on-going monitoring and review of dust;(v) identify trigger levels to be used to ascertain when additional dust mitigation measures or actions to those identified in (ii) and (iii) will need to be implemented and provide details of what those additional measures or actions would be following the approval of the scheme,
--	---

	the winning and working of mineral shall be permitted to commence and the scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the development.
--	---

Barbara Campbell, an objector, commented as follows:-

- The proposed conditions did not take into account several recommendations made by statutory consultees and independent experts.
- According to the Environmental Impact Assessment, the proposed depth of this quarry would be 15m and extraction would commence in the North East Section of the site. This appeared to contradict the applicant's report subsequently submitted by Touchstone which stated that, a depth of 15m could only be achieved in the central parts of the site and a geotechnical assessment would be needed to confirm slope stability at this depth. Touchstone said that extraction would need to begin not in the North East section but in the central parts of the site. This was contrary to the plans submitted and proposed conditions that were being considered today.
- Conditions should not be agreed until a revised extraction plan and Geotechnical Assessment had been submitted.
- Even a very small change in water table levels would impact the fishing lake and the Medieval Moat, home to a large population of Great Crested Newt. The Environment Agency had recommended 12 months water table and water balance monitoring. However, only 3 months water table monitoring had been stipulated and no water balance monitoring included in the Planning Conditions.
- Although this quarry was to be wet worked dust would still be created from haul roads, handling and loading and from the top 3m of extraction until the water table was reached. Most PM10 dust dispersed within 100m of the source. Therefore, the properties and people that fell within this boundary were at risk from dust that was known to be potentially harmful to health. Consequently, a planning condition was required to specify a maximum dust trigger level at which additional mitigation measures were employed or the activity ceased to protect the health and well-being of residents.
- Lizards and snakes were regularly seen around the perimeter of the site and, in particular, the area adjacent to the proposed entrance. The accuracy of the Ecology Survey was questioned and requested that a reptile survey was completed in advance of any extraction.
- The site exit was unsafe due to limited vision and the narrow width of the road. Even with passing places and some widening the road would remain too narrow for vehicles to pass safely. Most at risk would be pedestrians and cyclists. It was essential that a foot and cycle path was provided before excavations commenced. If it was considered unreasonable for the applicant to pay for this then it should be financed by the Highway Authority.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020**

- Finally, due to the proximity of residential properties and the impact upon the quality of residents' lives, the hours of operation should be 0800 to 6pm and not 0700 to 1900. This would be comparable to the conditions agreed by this Committee in July to a ROMP site where the extraction seemed to be much further away from residential properties.

A Member questioned Barbara Campbell on whether she had seen the Highway Authority's response which indicated that Rookery Lane was safe. Barbara Campbell stated that she had seen their initial response to the Environmental Statement last year but not any response to the report residents had commissioned from Ian Turvey.

Ian Briggs, representing the applicant, commented as follows:-

- The Sudbrook quarry application had drawn a lot of interest from the local community. We understood that a proposal like this would inevitably result in some concern locally but we believed that we had prepared a sound scheme that would protect the community and environment whilst still allowing the quarry development to proceed.
- ROMP schemes arose because planning permission already existed; so today's decision was not about whether the quarry should be allowed or not, it was about modernising the conditions attached to an existing permission for a small sand quarry.
- The ROMP legislation provided two choices: either that the scheme as proposed should be approved or that it should be amended to address some other essential matter.
- We did not believe any further changes were necessary but, if you did, your officer notes (at paragraph 38) the statutory tests for any changes.
- Our scheme was developed over four years and during that time we had: (a) redesigned the operation to minimise effects; had assessed the likely environmental impacts; incorporated mitigation measures where needed; assessed the traffic and roads; proposed a traffic routing and road improvements on Rookery Lane; even altered the timings of site traffic to ensure quarry traffic avoids the peak school bus times.
- The Committee report said (at para 71), that the scheme would reduce the impacts to a satisfactory level so that the development would not have an unacceptable effect on the area.
- To summarise, Sudbrook quarry was a very small sand quarry. It already had a planning permission but what was missing was a scheme of modern conditions. The scheme debated today would provide those missing controls by replacing 5 conditions with over 40.
- We said the scheme would work.
- The statutory consultees said it would work;
- Your officers agreed and had recommended approval.

Ian Briggs responded to questions from Members:-

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020

- In response to a question about the depth of excavation, Ian Briggs stated that it was proposed to remove the top 1 metre of soil and then excavate 2 metres of sand which would be above the water-table. The site would be excavated to 15 metres and the depth of excavation was constrained by the capability of the excavator.
- In response to a question about the removal of soil he stated that it was proposed to use most of the soil on site to help the creation of a reed bed around the lake and any excess soil would be taken and either spread to the applicant's adjoining farmland or off-site.
- In response to an enquiry about the risk of water entering excavated areas and causing slippage to the bank sides, Ian Briggs explained that the applicant was required to comply with the Quarry Regulations 1999 and carry out regular reviews of the site operations which included following the advice of any geotechnical assessment.

Councillor R Wootten, the local Member, commented as follows:-

- There was anger and disbelief amongst local residents that the Council had not listened to their concerns about the implications of this application on their community.
- Times had changed drastically since the application was first approved in 1953.
- The independent consultant's report made reference to the width of the highway for passing vehicles stating that there should be a minimum width of 5.9 metres for HGVs. Rookery Lane was less than 4 metres in width.
- The sight lines from the entrance/exit to the site on Rookery Lane were inadequate.
- Rookery Lane did not meet the highway's standard in paragraph 109 of NPPF as stated in the documentation Mr John Cairns MBE, a local resident, had submitted to the Council.
- Rookery Lane was not suitable for HGVs.
- There was a risk to the safety of residents walking along Rookery Lane.
- Rookery Lane needed widening and a footpath.
- The proposals to patch the road were unacceptable.
- There was a need to reduce the speed limit on the A153 at its' junction with Rookery Lane from the direction of West Willoughby as this was a dangerous junction.
- He referred to a Government report in connection with preventing HGVs using unsuitable roads published in 2011 and the current sign on the A153 warning that Rookery Lane was unsuitable for HGVs was still valid.
- The local MP, local Councillors and local Parish Councils supported refusal of this application.

Councillor A Maughan, a neighbouring local Member, commented as follows:-

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020**

- He spoke as the County Councillor for the adjoining electoral Division and as a resident who had lived in the parish of Ancaster, Sudbrook and West Willoughby for the first 22 years of his life.
- An advisory sign had existed for some years at the Rookery Lane/A153 junction advising that Rookery Lane was not suitable for HGV vehicles. The two passing places proposed were welcomed but there was no guarantee the passing places would be used.
- Rookery Lane was also used regularly by pedestrians. School children, in particular, used Rookery Lane to access the bus stop on the A153. The proposed breaks in the HGV flows, whilst protecting school children at those peak times, did not mitigate the safety risks to pedestrians at all other times of the day. It was bizarre that highways had not considered the safety risk at all times of the day, especially in the mornings and on Saturdays, when I knew, as a local dog walker, there could be many people walking along Rookery Lane in and out of Woodland Waters and up to the footpath that ran along the A153 all the way to Ancaster.
- The only way to mitigate the safety risks for all pedestrians was to condition the construction of a footpath along Rookery Lane or install adequate street lighting. I urge all Members to support this request.
- Moreover, the Rookery Lane/A153 junction did not have clear visibility when turning onto the A153 due to the hump in the road on the approach from West Willoughby. I am sure this was noticed on your site visit. If slow-turning HGVs were to use this junction it should be conditioned that the 40mph limit along the A153 was extended from outside Woodland Waters to the western end of West Willoughby. This would ensure that HGVs using this junction had more time to make a safe turning into the road.
- Furthermore, the current condition of Rookery Lane was inadequate with evident structural and surface defects. Potholes were frequently reported on Rookery Lane but less frequently repaired. This was understandable considering the current use of the road, but 6 HGV movements per hour over 6 days a week is a material change of use. This would significantly impact on the condition and safety of the road. Would the highway authority commit to raising the hierarchy of the road as part of this application? Is it a justifiable use of taxpayer's money to increase the maintenance burden of the road as a result of excessive and unsuitable HGV use? This would lead to either extra maintenance costs or additional insurance claims against the Council. These liabilities to the County Council must be considered by Members.
- Furthermore, the site was opposite the Woodland Waters campsite and along a very popular walking route. It was also in close proximity to residential properties. Government guidance suggested that noise which unreasonably and sustainably interfered with the use or enjoyment of a home or other premises would count as a statutory nuisance. The highest prescribed noise levels for residential areas was between 45-55db, therefore the potential noise levels from this site at 70db could be reasonably expected to materially impact on nearby residents in Sudbrook.
- In summary, I support the calls from local County Councillor Ray Wootten for this application to be refused in its current form. I hoped that further

consideration would be given to more appropriate conditions that better protected the interests of local residents.

Officers in response to the comments stated that many of the issues raised were addressed in the report, including measures for the suppression of dust, that no objections had been received from the Environment Agency; that the monitoring of groundwater was appropriate; that highways had not raised any issues including supporting the installation of passing places and were satisfied that the sight lines from the site onto Rookery Lane and from the A153 junction were appropriate; that the design manual quoted in connection with road width was for streets in a more modern urban setting and that the noise levels identified met national guidance in respect of mineral workings which allowed levels up to a maximum of 55dB for normal operations but higher levels of 70dB for temporary works such as for the construction of bunds but only then for limited period of no more than 8 weeks per year.

Comments by Members and officer responses included:-

- The site visit was useful.
- Some felt at risk walking down Rookery Lane to the application site and especially when a tractor came down the Lane towards Sudbrook. Rookery Lane needed to be widened. Officers reiterated the conditions in the report for Rookery Lane and that the Council was only able to consider what was proportionate. The staggering of the movement of HGVs was aligned with the local school bus service and that if there was any change to the proposed hours of operation when HGVs used Rookery Lane this might lead to an increase in HGVs in the time available.
- It was unlikely that the Council would provide street lights as it was their policy to turn them off.
- The vegetation near the entrance/exit to the applicant's site needed to be cut back to improve vision for vehicles entering and exiting the site.
- The Rookery Lane/A153 junction was not safe especially as traffic travelled at speed along the A153.
- Dust mitigation measures were needed.
- There was no room for cyclists or pedestrians on Rookery Lane.
- There had been a lot of changes since the application was approved in 1953 and planning had also changed.
- A footpath and street lighting should be installed on Rookery Lane.
- The movement of HGVs needed more restrictions than that proposed in the report to accommodate school children walking to catch the bus to school along Rookery Lane.
- If Rookery Lane was currently that unsafe why were school children using the Lane?
- The comments by Ancaster Parish Council on page 57 of the report had been addressed.
- The speed of traffic on the A153 could be an issue and should be examined by highways.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 OCTOBER 2020**

- It was noted that there was a railway line on Rookery Lane near the application site.
- The quarry was small compared to some of the quarries considered by Members.
- The application would not disappear and therefore was it not better for the application to proceed and the site restored similar to that at Woodland Waters which was an asset for the local community.
- It was noted that it was proposed to plant trees and landscape the site. Were there any plans for planting close to the property known as "Norwood"? Officers stated that it was proposed to construct a bund along this boundary with stand-off between the property and the bund. No planting was proposed within the stand-off area.
- It was noted that the applicant had acquired land adjacent to the application site. Did the applicant propose to excavate this site for minerals? Officers stated that if the applicant submitted an application to seek mineral extraction on the land he owned adjacent to the current application it would have to meet the need criteria in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan covering the period up to 2031. The Plan already made sufficient provision for sand and gravel for this period and therefore a speculative application by the applicant would not receive support from officers and therefore highly unlikely to gain planning permission. However, officers stated that in any case this was not for consideration at today's meeting and instead the Committee could only consider what was in front of them which was a site that had planning permission already. The purpose of this application was to modernise the planning conditions only.
- It was noted that the current hours of operation were from 07:00 to 19:00 with exceptions for HGVs when school children were walking along Rookery Lane in the morning and afternoon. This might cause problems for HGVs caught up in traffic on route to the site and there did not appear to be any parking available for HGVs in the event of this happening. It was suggested that perhaps there should be a longer exclusion time for HGVs using Rookery Lane which would provide more certainty to all parties. Officers stated that the HGV movements were supported by highways, aligned with the school bus timetable and addressed the concerns of local residents.
- The local Members had made good presentations. However, the Council was dealing with a "Dormant" application and permission had been given many years ago and therefore Members was only able to examine the conditions.
- A condition was required that wheels of vehicles leaving the applicant's site on to Rookery Lane should be washed. Officers stated that condition 26 covered wheel washing and the applicant could be requested to clean the road if any material came from the quarry.

A motion by Councillor T A Ashton, seconded by Councillor I G Fleetwood, that the recommendations detailed in the report subject to the amendments to Conditions 10 and 35 recommended by officers.

Following a further suggestion from Councillor Mrs A M Newton, it was agreed that an amendment should also be made to Condition 19 so that HGVs would be

restricted from using Rookery Lane between 16:30 and 18:00 hours so as to avoid those times school children used Rookery Lane to catch and return on the school bus. Councillors T A Ashton and I G Fleetwood stated that they were prepared to accept an amendment to their motion to the proposed revised times and therefore approve the conditions as detailed in the report subject to amendments to Conditions 10 and 35 recommended by officers and the amendment to Condition 19 as proposed by the Committee, as detailed below.

RESOLVED (8 votes for, 0 votes against and 1 abstention)

- (a) That the applicant be invited to enter into a Section 106 Planning Obligation to secure a sum of £3,600 to cover the costs of the Highway Authority in removing existing advisory signage on Rookery Lane and the production and provision of new road HGV route direction and advance warning signage on Rookery Lane and the A153; and
- (b) Subject to the conclusion of the Planning Obligation in (a) above, the Executive Director for Place be authorised to issue the decision notice with the revised schedule of conditions as set out in Appendix A of this report and subject to further amendments as follows:-

Revised Condition 10 - Ecology

Prior to any vegetation clearance or stripping of soils taking place within each phase of the development, an updated pre-construction Great Crest Newt and Reptile survey shall be carried out and the results submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority. In the event that reptiles or great crested newts are found to be present, then no works shall take place until a detailed method statement including details of the measures to be adopted to displace and protect such species from the works has first been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Revised Condition 19 – Hours of Operation

Other than for essential maintenance or in an emergency to maintain safe quarry working, operations and activities associated with the Site shall only be carried out between the following times:

Mineral extraction, processing and soil stripping / restoration

Monday to Friday - 0800 hours to 1900 hours

Saturdays - 0900 hours to 1300 hours

No operations shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays.

HGV Traffic

Monday to Friday - 0700 hours to 19.00 hours except between the following times during school term time:
0715 hours to 0800 hours;

1630 hours to 1800 hours

Saturdays 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours

No operations shall be carried out on Sundays or Public and Bank Holidays

Revised Condition 35 - Dust

No winning and working of mineral shall take place until a scheme and programme of measures for the suppression of dust has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based upon the operational mitigation measures and practices as set out within the Dust Management Plan (contained within Schedule 4 of Appendix B of the Environmental Statement) and include the following:

- (i) a description of the baseline conditions and levels experienced around the site;
- (ii) identify the measures to be employed to suppress dust caused by the moving, processing and storage of soil, overburden, stone and other materials within the site;
- (iii) include details of the dust suppression measures to be applied on haul roads, including speed limits;
- (iv) include details of the measures to be adopted for monitoring dust levels from the site including the location and type of any dust monitoring points and a scheme for the on-going monitoring and review of dust;
- (v) identify trigger levels to be used to ascertain when additional dust mitigation measures or actions to those identified in (ii) and (iii) will need to be implemented and provide details of what those additional measures or actions would be.

Following the approval of the scheme, the winning and working of mineral shall be permitted to commence and the scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details for the duration of the development.

(c) That this report forms part of the Council's Statement pursuant to Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which requires the Council to make available for public inspection at the District Council's Offices specified information regarding the decision. Pursuant to Regulation 30(1)(d) the Council must make available for public inspection a statement which contains:

- the reasoned conclusion of the Council on the significant effects of the development on the environment, taking into account an examination of the environmental information;
- any conditions to which the decision is subject which relate to the likely significant environmental effects of the development on the environment;
- a description of any features of the development and any measures envisaged in order to avoid, prevent, reduce and, if possible, offset likely significant adverse effects on the environment;
- any monitoring measures considered appropriate by the Council;
- the main reasons and considerations on which the decision is based including, if relevant, information about the participation of the public;
- a summary of the results of the consultations undertaken, and

information gathered, in respect of the application and how those results have been incorporated or otherwise addressed;

- information regarding the right to challenge the validity of the decision and the procedures for doing so.

The meeting closed at 12.29 pm