

## NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

### STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

At the meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held at Council Chamber - County Hall on Tuesday, 7 June 2022 at 4.00 pm.

#### PRESENT

T Thorne (Chair) (in the Chair)

#### MEMBERS

C Ball	R Dodd
J Foster	G Hill
Jl Hutchinson	J Lang
G Renner-Thompson	M Robinson
G Stewart	M Swinbank
A Wallace	A Watson

#### OTHER COUNCILLORS

J Riddle

#### OFFICERS

T Crowe	Solicitor
G Halliday	Consultant Planner
L Little	Senior Democratic Services Officer
R Murfin	Interim Executive Director of Planning & Local Services
K Tipple	Senior Planner
T Wood	Principal Planning Officer

Around 11 members of the press and public were present.

#### 1 PROCEDURE AT PLANNING COMMITTEES

The Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

#### 2 MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

**RESOLVED** that the Membership and Terms of Reference of the Strategic Planning Committee as agreed at Annual Council on 4 May 2022 be noted.

Ch.'s Initials.....

### 3 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Flux, Darwin and Reid.

### 4 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committees held on Tuesday 4 April 2022 and Tuesday 3 May 2022, as circulated, were agreed as a true record and were signed by the Chair.

### 5 **DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Renner-Thompson advised that he was a Director of Advance Northumberland and would therefore leave the Chamber whilst application 22/00879/FUL was considered.

### 6 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The report requested the Committee to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications.

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

Councillor Renner-Thompson left the Chamber at this point.

### 7 **22/00879/FUL**

**Erection of building for manufacturing of subsea cables, with ancillary offices and outdoor cable storage, together with associated development and infrastructure works including vehicular accesses off Brock Lane, landscaping and vehicular parking  
Land North of Blyth Power Station Substation, East Sleekburn,  
Northumberland**

T Wood, Principal Planning Officer provided an introduction to the application with the aid of a power point presentation. Site videos had also been circulated to Members in advance of the Meeting. The Officer advised that there was a slight amendment to a plan number in the proposed condition 2 in that the main site access general arrangement plan number should read PO2 and not PO1.

J Young, Chief Strategy and Compliance Officer, JDR Cables addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following information:-

Ch.'s Initials.....

- JDR Cables System was a leading provider of subsea cable technology and off shore services to connect the global offshore energy industry. Its success was based on technical expertise and the reliability and supply of subsea power cables and associated hardware and accessories with its first offshore wind contract won in 2006 and a manufacturing facility opening in Hartlepool in 2009. Following further investment in 2016 this factory was now one of the most advanced subsea cable manufacturing facilities in the world.
- JDR were now looking to expand their manufacturing facilities with another factory in Cambois which would focus on renewable energy products and services.
- JDR were the only manufacturer of this type of cable in the UK and the proposed development was the next phase of innovation with new capacity for longer and higher voltage cables to serve the growing offshore market. It would bring more skilled jobs to Cambois, Northumberland and the wider North East.
- The new facility would help the UK to meet its target of 40 gigawatt of renewable energy by 2030 and assist the Government's target of net zero carbon emissions by 2050.
- At opening it would have 170 office and operations staff and would have a maximum capacity of 207 staff. JDR would seek to provide local residents with employment opportunities for 10 years from the opening of the plant including work experience, apprenticeships, internships and graduate engineering traineeships secured through an employment plan as part of the S106 agreement.
- JDR would also seek to provide local residents with training opportunities for at least 10 years by building relationships with local colleges and universities and providing mentoring and interview training secured through a training skills plan as part of the S106 agreement.
- JDR already had a number of STEM ambassadors and mentors supporting local communities bringing hands on training opportunities and it was expected this would be replicated in Cambois.
- JDR were aware of the work on the British Volt site and they would seek to work with them to ensure that any impact from the construction on the JDR site would be kept to a minimum.
- JDR and their contractors would continue to work with the local community and Parish Council and keep them informed of each stage of construction.

Karon Beech, from Vincent & Gorbing, Planning Architects and Consultants working on the project, also addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The application contained a suite of technical documents. The transport assessment confirmed that there would be no significant impact on the road network as a result of a maximum of 44 additional car movements and 14 lorry movements per day.
- Highways England had advised that a Highways Operational Management Plan would be required to manage the impact the development would have on the A19 Moor Farm roundabout during the peak morning and evening periods and JDR were happy to accept this condition.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The submitted landscape assessment confirmed that the impact of the character of the site, its setting and the landscape from close and distant views were acceptable. There was a landscape buffer between the site and the nearest residents with an illustrative landscape plan submitted to show how additional on-site planting with more mature trees could help the buffer and JDR were happy to accept this as a planning condition.
- The development would not have any impact on any sensitive areas in the locality and a significant net biodiversity gain, well in excess of the 10% required.
- There would be no harmful impact to the setting of the Grade II listed coal staithes.
- Development was deemed to be acceptable in terms of surface water, flood risk and foul water drainage.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee, the following information was provided by Officers:-

- Comments made regarding traffic had been referred to Highways and responses were contained in paragraphs 7.42 – 7.46 of the report. The baseline traffic surveys were those which had been used as part of the British Volt application in 2020 and had been replicated for use in relation to this application and it was not considered that a maximum of 44 trips per hour would have a significant impact on the overall capacity.
- The sustainable transport plan would actively manage the whole operation and logistics of the site in relation to minimising the impact on the Moor Farm Roundabout as required by National Highways.
- The S106 would be very detailed and guarantee skills training and support etc to ensure that the economic benefits of the development were realised locally with work to develop this undertaken in conjunction with the Council's Education and Skills Section.
- This site did not have the rich ecology to replace, unlike the British Volt Site, and therefore the 10% biodiversity net gain could be achieved on site.
- If the application was permitted then a S78 Highways Act Agreement would be required which would look at road safety and would consider if any footpath or lighting provision was required as part of the application.
- A request would be made to the applicants to enable the existing Gatehouse to the former power station, which was a source of pride to the local community, to be kept as a tribute to the cultural heritage of the area.
- Condition 18 requested details of a Construction Management Statement to be submitted and agreed which would include wheel washing for HGV vehicles leaving the construction site.
- It was clarified that 95% of the cables produced would be transported by the River and the application had the support of the Port of Blyth.
- There was a lot of economic growth occurring in the South East of the County with implications of this on the road and footpath/cycleway networks. Once National Highways had confirmed their proposals for Moor Farm Roundabout which would take into account the maximum cumulative developments in a set period of time, then a masterplan for the economic corridor would be drawn up informing the scale of

Ch.'s Initials.....

- investment for infrastructure that would be required.
- The Environment Agency no longer objected to the application.
- It was confirmed that the S106 agreement had been agreed in preparation of this application being agreed.

Councillor Wallace on behalf of the community of Cambois advised that he wished to propose acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report which was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

Members in welcoming the investment into Cambois hoped it would lead to improved public transport links for the residents of Cambois and that the infrastructure required would be provided in a timely manner. The opportunities to get local people back into employment were particularly welcomed. Officers were thanked for their work in bringing this much needed investment into the area.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application in line with the recommendation in the report and it was unanimously:

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report and completion of the S106 agreement to secure an Employment Plan and a Training Skills Plan.

Councillor Renner-Thompson returned to the Chamber at this point.

8

**20/03660/CCMEIA**

**Lateral extension to north of existing quarry boundary for the phased extraction of approximately 2.7 million tonnes of whinstone and restoration of site to agricultural grassland and nature conservation uses. Divet Hill Quarry, Capheaton, Newcastle upon Tyne, Northumberland NE19 2BG**

An introduction to the application was provided by G Halliday, Consultant Planner with the aid of a power point presentation. Videos of the site had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting and the Chair advised that he had also visited the site.

J Pearson addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of local residents in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The proposal was too close to homes and living spaces bringing quarry operations within 125m of the nearest properties at Clay Walls Farm, 250m of homes at Great Bavington and 350m of homes at Newonstead.
- Great Bavington Conservation Area was something that the villages had worked on with Tynedale Council to establish. The Conservation Area appraisal document set out the important characteristics of the area and what was essential to its preservation. The setting, landscape and views in and out of the Conservation Area were highlighted as key components and these were to be sacrificed to this quarry.
- Committee was being told that the impact would be limited due to the 9-10 year timeframe for quarrying, however no account had been taken of

Ch.'s Initials.....

the 2 year restoration and up to 15 years for that restoration to be effective, or of the permanent landscape changes. An estimated total of 27 years which would be determined by the sale of the crushed rock.

- The report stated there was 46 years' worth of permitted hard rock reserves in Northumberland which was many more times the amount prescribed by the NPPF and the Northumberland Local Plan (NLP), with an argument about productive capacity and flexibility in applying policy. On closer examination this meant that some quarry operators were managing the supply to market by holding some 18% of those reserves in inactive quarries. Residents would argue that this was the natural reaction of businesses in an over-supplied market and yet they were being asked to sacrifice their Conservation Area and residential amenity so that Breedon could have a slice of that pie at Divet Hill. Applying policy flexibly should also mean examining how the market was operating and not just approving another quarry to attempt to level the playing field.
- This application was for permission to quarry 2.7 million tonnes of rock whilst there were three inactive sites within a few miles holding 9.7 million tonnes of reserves. Swinburne, had 5.25m million tonnes with permission until 2036, Mootlaw had 4.1 million tonnes with permission until 2025 and Cocklaw had 700,000 tonnes and permission until 2042. Balancing those numbers with the impact this proposal would have on local people and places, why was approval needed for the Divet Hill extension? It was clearly more about who controlled the rights of the reserves and market rather than ensuring a continuous supply.
- In 2019 residents asked Committee to reject the application for the Divet Hill Farm Extension due to the issues residents were having with noise. At that time it was stated that the noise conditions being proposed were some of the tightest in Northumberland, however that optimism was misplaced and sadly those same conditions were being presented again for this application.
- Those conditions did not meet the six tests set out in the NPPF. They were not precise, enforceable or in some cases not relevant to the development to be permitted and in total did not deal with the noise issues residents had experienced for in recent years.
- Condition 22 set noise limits for day time operations but took no account of the peaks of noise, the crashes and bangs associated with moving rock and loading the crusher and the horns and beepers that were common all day from 6.00 am. The new proposal introduced the use of dumper trucks taking newly blasted rock from the face to the crusher, loading and tipping each time. Residents dreaded the extra noise that this would create. Impulsive and peak noises were recognised as an issue in Government Minerals Guidance which was suffered already but this was not addressed by a condition in this proposal.

Councillor Peter Ramsden addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of Bavington Parish Council in objection to the application. His comments included the following:-

- This current proposal to extend Divet Hill Quarry had been an agenda item at successive Parish Council meetings. At the outside in July 2018, the Parish Council received a presentation from the Developers and

Ch.'s Initials.....

subsequently arranged a public meeting in December 2020 to canvass local views.

- One member of the Parish Council was conflicted over the proposal and apart from his immediate family, there was a universal view against the proposal.
- The local community had lived in proximity to the Quarry over many years and lived with the associated noise, dust and the constant traffic movements of heavy wagons. However, this proposal, involving quarrying just 190 metres west of the village of Great Bavington represented a new threat of a different magnitude to local residents.
- The Built Heritage and Design Officer indicated that this proposal would be harmful to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area of Great Bavington and in assessing the application, great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation. The Conservation status places certain obligations on local residents but it also should offer some measure of protection. The Parish Council is not convinced that the proposals offer adequate mitigation measures to offset this threat posed and had a clear view that if local opinion was to count or if Conservation status was to have significance then this application should be rejected.

Councillor J Riddle, Local Ward Member, addressed the Committee. His comments included the following:-

- This was a finely balanced decision the Committee were being asked to make, with its very significant effect on the Conservation Area and there was clearly not a need for this quarry. There were quarries with reserves with roughly four times what this quarry would produce in the immediate vicinity and over 40 years supply in the County and this extension was not needed.
- This was a business opportunity and was about profit with residents suffering a loss of amenity for years and he had been and heard the noise which they had to put up with.
- It had been disappointing that the in person site visit had been cancelled as the videos provided were not a true representative of the noise from the site and he asked Members to defer the application in order to visit the site.
- As far as he was aware it was not local employment for local residents.
- The hamlets of Little Bavington and Great Bavington were very close by and noise complaints had been made for some time now and had now in fact been referred to the Local Government Ombudsman in relation to how the Council had dealt with this.
- The loss of amenity, the dust and the noise were all too much for something which was not really needed and it was just a financial opportunity for the developer.

J Garbutt, Planning & Estates Manager for Breedon, addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- From his experience Divet Hill was a very well run site, well organised with a good access road and processing plant located to minimise any adverse impacts with an excellent safety record.
- Restoration works were well advanced and over the coming years large

Ch.'s Initials.....

- parts would also be restored to provide high quality habitat.
- The site was well established and had continued producing construction materials for many years and had the necessary infrastructure to continue operating in an efficient and environmentally friendly way.
- Minerals were essential to society and could only be worked where they were found and a degree of compromise had to be used in developing sites. Maintaining a supply of construction materials in an area was essential to allow economic development. Divet Hill provided a high quality dolomite stone which could be used in a variety of construction uses and the site also had an asphalt plant to produce tarmac for road surfacing.
- The northern extension was an allocated site in the recently adopted NLP and had been identified to produce minerals over the plan period. Whilst it had been suggested that there was no need for the site as Northumberland had a lot of reserves, this did not give a true picture as a large amount was tied up in one site which might not have the capacity to supply more material and 17% of the reserves were in sites which were not active which could be due to a range of issues.
- This site was needed and had already been considered to be a good site through the planning allocation process, with details submitted to the Council confirming this position.
- Almost all statutory consultees accept that, with appropriate planning conditions, to control environmental impacts the development could proceed. The exception to this being the Building Conservation Officer in relation to the setting of the Great Bavington Conservation Area which would only be impacted during the time limited extension to the site.
- The site had been an important supplier in the past to various works within Northumberland and would supply future important developments in the County.
- The site had operated in compliance with its planning consent for many years and had more recently undertaken noise and dust monitoring to demonstrate compliance and reports regularly provided to the Council.
- Breedon was a very responsible operator going beyond the minimum required and who had raised the bar on sustainability issues. The restoration of the site would include whin grass land which could only be created by quarrying activities.
- A Quarry Liaison Group would also be established to assist in dealing with any complaints from residents.
- The retention of the site would secure the 22 full time jobs at the quarry which were local to Northumberland, contributing to securing another 20 contractor/haulier jobs which were linked on a part time basis to the quarry.
- He hoped that the Committee would agree to grant permission to secure the future of the site and jobs.

The following information was provided in response to questions from Members of the Committee:-

- It was not known why the other quarries containing reserves were not operational, but this could be for a variety of technical, economic or geological reasons.

Ch.'s Initials.....



- This quarry first started operating in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and had operated under planning controls since 1947. It was originally a much smaller operation but has operated at the current level of tonnage for a number of years.
- The 40 years supply of reserves related to the whole of Northumberland, however there were no crushed rock quarries in Tyne and Wear and therefore the market area was wider than Northumberland. The main markets for this quarry were in South East Northumberland and Tyne and Wear, with another operator supplying the main market in the North of the County. The Local Plan Inspector agreed that this site was appropriate and as such it had been allocated in the NLP.
- It was normal to require a restoration bond in respect of high impact schemes of short duration due to the risks involved. These historically related to opencast coal schemes. The quarrying of crushed rock took place over a greater timescale and used progressive restoration. The risk was lower and therefore a bond was not required.
- Issues around noise had been looked at by Public Protection with a large volume of Government Good Practice available. The existing background noise levels were established and limits imposed on how much this could increase during quarrying operations. Quieter areas would be subject to more restrictions. Full noise monitoring would be undertaken and the establishment of the Liaison Group would assist in discussions surrounding any noise complaints by bringing the Operator and residents together and such groups had worked well on many open casting sites in the area.
- There was no technical grounds to refuse the application related to noise as these were within Government limits. The existing plant equipment had been moved in October 2021 further into the site and away from Great Bavington and Little Bavington and away from properties. Its location would now cause less adverse harm than when the application was originally submitted two years ago. It was made clear that the application could be refused on the basis of the impact on the Conservation Area. This would be a matter of planning balance. The Officer appraisal and advice was however that the limited impact, when balanced against the identified benefits, most reasonably pointed to approval subject to conditions.
- Bavington Parish Council did not appear at the examination stage of the Local Plan when the Planning Inspector looked at mineral provision as a whole. There was a demonstrable need for crushed rock provision and each site location was looked at to ascertain if it was appropriate to allocation in the plan. The conclusion was that this quarry was appropriate and the allocation was deliverable.
- The provision of soil mounds around sites was standard practice with the Conservation Officer stating that these would be a manmade element which was not there at present. Looking out from the Conservation Area a stone wall was a strong element in its setting and apart from the soil mounds the proposed development would not be visible. The soil mounds would be slightly higher and would be visible and this had been judged by Planning Officers that the adverse harm was not sufficient in the planning balance to outweigh the benefits of the working of the site.
- Whilst restoration had been undertaken on parts of the site, it was

Ch.'s Initials.....

necessary for a new restoration plan to be agreed to allow the plant, office and roads to remain in place during the extended working of the site.

Councillor Hill left the meeting at this point.

Councillor Robinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to grant permission as outlined in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Wallace.

In debating the application, the remoteness of the site was highlighted. The Chair advised that on his visit to the site that morning he had found it to be well organised and tidy and that over the last few years the tree planting around the site had helped to screen the quarry. Members had sympathy with residents, but it was hoped that the new monitoring system and Liaison Group would assist and considered that appropriate assessments had been undertaken as part of the examination of the NLP.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant permission as follows:- FOR 8; AGAINST 4; ABSTENSIONS 0.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

9

**20/03661/VARCCM**

**Variation of conditions 1 (duration of operations), 2 (approved plans), 17 (noise) and 30 (restoration) of planning permission 17/04637/VARCCM to extend the duration of consented operations, amend the approved documentation associated with the operation and amend the noise limits applicable to the operation**

**Divet Hill Quarry, Capheaton, Newcastle upon Tyne, Northumberland NE19 2BG**

An introduction to the application was provided by G Halliday, Consultant Planner with the aid of a power point presentation who advised that the variation of conditions was required in order to implement the extension to the quarry which was approved under the previous application.

J Pearson addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. Her comments included the following:-

- The Conservation Area boundary was less than 200m from the site and 250m from homes.
- In 2019 residents asked Committee to reject the application for the Divet Hill Farm Extension due to the issues residents were having with noise. At that time it was stated that the noise conditions being proposed were some of the tightest in Northumberland, however that optimism was misplaced and sadly those same conditions were being presented again for this application.
- Those conditions did not meet the six tests set out in the NPPF. They were not precise, enforceable or in some cases not relevant to the development to be permitted and in total did not deal with the noise

Ch.'s Initials.....

- issues residents had and continued to experience.
- Condition 22 set noise limits for day time operations but took no account of the peaks of noise, the crashes and bangs associated with moving rock and loading the crusher and the horns and beepers that were common all day from 6.00 am. The new proposal introduced the use of dumper trucks taking newly blasted rock from the face to the crusher, loading and tipping each time. Residents dreaded the extra noise that this would create. Impulsive and peak noises were recognised as an issue in Government Minerals Guidance which was suffered already but this was not addressed by a condition in this proposal.
  - Condition 24 stated “temporary operations such as soil striping or placement and the construction and removal of screen mounds shall not exceed a noise level of 70 Db for any longer than 8 weeks in any 12 month period at any residential property”. The expression “such as” does not pass the test of precision required by the NPPF. While it did set a limit of 70dB, the practicality of measuring over 8 weeks in any 12 months makes it imprecise and unenforceable. For example, assume that in response to a complaint the noise level was measured and found to be over 70dB, is that a breach or does the monitoring then continue to the next hour and the next etc for the next 8 weeks and potentially for a year? This has been discussed at length with the Environmental Health Officer who could not advise how that condition could be measured or enforced.
  - If Members approved this application then they were signing up to say that they understood and approved the planning conditions. If the workings of the conditions were not understood or they thought they needed to be improved then Members needed to reject the application.
  - The second reason that residents had no confidence in the noise conditions was that the Council had a woeful record in dealing with noise complaints about the quarry and dealing with the complaints about not dealing with the original noise complaints. It was not the Council who measured noise following a complaint, they abdicated their responsibility in the matter and relied on the quarry operator to hire a noise man.
  - Even following a statutory noise nuisance complaint it had taken one year for the Council to offer noise monitoring at their property and by that time the crushing plant had been moved and operations at the north end of the site that were causing problems were coming to an end.
  - After 4 years, dozens of complaints and raising a statutory noise nuisance complaint, neither the Council or the operator had recorded or assessed the noise which had woken them up from their beds, driven them indoors from their garden and invaded their living room. It was a long complex saga and the Council’s handling of these matters was currently being investigated by the Local Government Ombudsman.
  - Their experience had indicated that these were problems with resources, practice and procedure within the Planning Department and would not be resolved by another noise complaint procedure that did not get implemented or a Community Liaison Group that had no teeth due to inadequate planning conditions.
  - Similar problems were being experienced with dust which was first raised in early 2020 with monitoring put in place in July 2020. Residents had seen no analysis or assessment of the results, there had been no

Ch.’s Initials.....

- changes and no less dust.
- Condition 26 which related to the problems of dust, had the same issue of not being relevant to this proposal as well as not being precise. It was known that the worst operations for creating dust were blasting, crushing plant and the coating plant and yet none of these were mentioned in the condition. Furthermore the measures listed in the condition would not deal with the dust fallout from any of these.
- Condition 27 stated that dust monitoring would continue, but to what end? There was no objective set other than to monitor. No levels were set therefore no enforcement was possible. This was what had been experienced in the last two years of monitoring, no report, no analysis, no feedback and no improvement.
- Members were asked to reject the application.

The following information was noted in response to questions from Members of the Committee:-

- Officers tried not to be too prescriptive about the cause of noise in the conditions. The conditions tried to look at the noise experienced at the boundaries of the noise sensitive properties and that was where the numerical decibel values were set. Normal practice on quarries throughout the Country required the operator themselves to monitor noise, the fall back was that if there was reason to believe that the operator was not carrying this out in a proper way then arrangements would be made for the Council to undertake this themselves. There had been resource issues with this as Public Protection did not have sufficient equipment to be able to attend when residents had asked. The new arrangement and Liaison Group would set up a working arrangement between the Quarry, the local community and the Council to agree how the site can be worked properly. The Operator would be doing more noise monitoring and a report would be provided to each Liaison meeting providing details of all complaints received and any actions they had taken to mitigate those problems. This was an established way of working and had worked well on other sites in the County. The conditions were in accordance with the six tests.
- There were two issues in relation to noise, i.e. planning conditions related to noise and also statutory noise nuisance. The problems in 2021 were in relation to Public Protection investigating a noise nuisance complaint as they were able to do that independent of any planning condition. The new regime would look at how conditions were complied with and Public Protection would be ongoing consultees on this, and when the effects of climatic conditions were understood then the Council would work with the operator and there could be a cessation of activities when climatic conditions affected the operations and this would also apply to dust from the site as well as noise.
- The conditions being included reflected the operations in 2022 with standards much stricter than previously. Government recommendations which had been set out in the report would be adhered to. The conditions were proper and reasonable and enforceable. The applicant, as part of their Environmental Statement submitted with the application, had to carry out a noise, a dust and a vibration assessment, which were then assessed by Environmental Health Officers. The noise

Ch.'s Initials.....

assessment showed that there would be the likelihood of two properties who might experience slightly higher levels by 1dB at one property and 2dB at the other, these had been accepted by the Environmental Health Officer as being realistic and that the limits were appropriate as they were significantly below the 55dB limit set by Government. The 70dB limit referred to by J Pearson in her address was also in accordance with Government guidance and was a standard practice in mineral operations for putting up soil mounds at the edge of the site which were closer to residential properties and have a leeway of temporary operations for 8 weeks. The works would be progressive and the condition was a standard enforceable condition. It might be that discussions could be held with the developer regarding continuing noise monitoring during the time that the mounds were being created and a slight tweak of the condition would be discussed with the Chair should Members be minded to approve the application.

- There were conditions requiring a noise scheme, a dust scheme and a blasting scheme to be submitted and issues would be addressed during this detailed stage.
- The Liaison Group would allow a direct route for complaints to the Operator when the activities were actually taking place.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report, which was seconded by Councillor Stewart. A vote was taken as follows:- FOR 8; AGAINST 3; ABSTENSION 1.

**RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

## 10 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During consideration of the previous item, the suspension of standing orders to allow the meeting to continue over the 3 hour limit was proposed by Councillor Hutchinson, seconded by Councillor Stewart and unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the Suspension of Standing Orders be agreed.

## 11 **APPEALS UPDATE**

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

## 12 **S106 AGREEMENTS UPDATE REPORT**

**RESOLVED** that the information be noted.

**CHAIR**.....

**DATE**.....

Ch.'s Initials.....