

## Agenda

**Meeting: Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee**

**Venue: The Grand Meeting Room,  
County Hall, Northallerton**

**Date: Tuesday, 4 April 2017 at  
10.00 a.m.**

Recording is allowed at County Council, committee and sub-committee meetings which are open to the public, please give due regard to the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at public meetings, a copy of which is available to download below. Anyone wishing to record is asked to contact, prior to the start of the meeting, the Officer whose details are at the foot of the first page of the Agenda. We ask that any recording is clearly visible to anyone at the meeting and that it is non-disruptive. <http://democracy.northyorks.gov.uk>

### Business

1. **Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 February 2017.** (Pages 5 to 9)
2. **Declarations of Interest.**
3. **Public Questions or Statements.**

Members of the public may ask questions or make statements at this meeting if they have given notice of their question/statement to Steve Loach of Democratic Services (*contact details below*) by midday on Thursday 30 March 2017. Each speaker should limit themselves to 3 minutes on any item. Members of the public who have given notice will be invited to speak:-

Continued overleaf/...

- at this point in the meeting if their questions/statements relate to matters which are not otherwise on the Agenda (subject to an overall time limit of 30 minutes); or
- when the relevant Agenda item is being considered if they wish to speak on a matter which is on the Agenda for this meeting

If you are exercising your right to speak at this meeting, but do not wish to be recorded, please inform the Chairman, who will instruct anyone who may be taking a recording to cease while you speak.

## **County Matters**

4. **C2/10/02487/CCC – (NY/2010/0356/ENV)** - Extraction and processing of sand and gravel including the construction of a site access, conveyors, bridges, associated plant and machinery with restoration to agriculture, nature conservation and wetland at Killerby Sand and Gravel Quarry, Killerby, North Yorkshire  
**(Pages 10 to 168)**
5. **C1/16/00507/CM – (NY/2016/0094/ENV)** - Variation of condition No's 1, 20, 23 & 52 of planning permission ref. C1/39/34G to allow the continuation of sand and gravel extraction for a further 4 year period until 31 December 2020 with final restoration by 31 December 2021 and removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022 and amendments to the phasing and direction of working and a reconfigured layout for the conveyor at Scorton Quarry, Richmond, North Yorkshire  
**(Pages 169 to 219)**

## **General**

6. **Items dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation** **(Pages 220 to 224)**
7. **Other business which the Chairman agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.**

## **PLEASE NOTE**

**Should it become apparent that the meeting will extend into the afternoon a lunch break will be taken at around 1pm**

Barry Khan  
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)  
County Hall  
Northallerton

## **NOTES:**

### **Emergency procedures for Meetings**

#### **Fire**

The fire evacuation alarm is a continuous Klaxon. On hearing this you should leave the building by the nearest safe fire exit. Once outside the building please proceed to the fire assembly point outside the main entrance. Persons should not re-enter the building until authorised to do so by the Fire and Rescue Service or the Emergency Co-ordinator.

An intermittent alarm indicates an emergency in nearby building. It is not necessary to evacuate the building but you should be ready for instructions from the Fire Warden.

**Accident or Illness**

First Aid treatment can be obtained by telephoning Extension 7575.

# Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee

## 1. Membership

County Councillors (11)							
	<i>Councillors Names</i>				<i>Political Party</i>		
1	BLADES, David				Conservative		
2	HESELTINE, Robert				Independent		
3	HOULT, Bill				Liberal Democrat		
4	IRETON, David				Conservative		
5	LEE, Andrew (Vice-Chairman)				Conservative		
6	LUNN, Cliff				Conservative		
7	McCARTNEY, John				NY Independent		
8	PACKHAM, Robert				Labour		
9	SOWRAY, Peter (Chairman)				Conservative		
10	TROTTER, Cliff				Conservative		
11	WINDASS, Robert				Conservative		
<b>Total Membership – (11)</b>				<b>Quorum – (3)</b>			
<b>Con</b>	<b>Lib Dem</b>	<b>NY Ind</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal</b>	<b>UKIP</b>	<b>Ind</b>	<b>Total</b>
7	1	1	1	0	0	1	11

## 2. Substitute Members

<b>Conservative</b>		<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	
	<i>Councillors Names</i>		<i>Councillors Names</i>
1	HARRISON-TOPHAM, Roger	1	JONES, Anne
2	WELCH, Richard	2	GRIFFITHS, Bryn
3	PEARSON, Chris	3	
4	JEFFELS, David	4	
5		5	
<b>NY Independent</b>		<b>Labour</b>	
	<i>Councillors Names</i>		<i>Councillors Names</i>
1	BARRETT, Philip	1	BROADBENT, Eric
2		2	
3		3	
4		4	
5		5	

## North Yorkshire County Council

### Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on 7 February 2017 at 10.00 am.

**Present:-**

County Councillors Peter Sowray (Chairman), Robert Heseltine, Bill Hoult, David Ireton, Cliff Lunn, John McCartney, Robert Packham, Cliff Trotter and Robert Windass.

There were three members of the public in attendance.

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors David Blades and Andrew Lee.

**Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book**

**218. Minutes**

**Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**219. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**220. Public Questions or Statements**

The represented of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) reported that there were no public questions or statements from members of the public.

**221. C8/2016/0873/CPO – (NY/2016/0118/ENV) – A 14.91 hectare extension to the existing sand quarry for the extraction of sand over a period of approximately 6 years at Hensall Sand Quarry, Broach Road, Hensall**

**Considered -**

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine a planning application for a 14.91 hectare extension to the existing sand quarry for the extraction of sand over a period of approximately six years on land at Hensall Sand Quarry, Broach Road, Hensall.

The application was subject to an objection having been raised by a member of public in respect of the proposal, which was summarised in the report, and was, therefore, reported to the Committee for determination.

A representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the Committee report, highlighting the proposal; the site description; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representation; planning guidance and policy; planning consideration;

NYCC Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee - Minutes - 7 February 2017/1

and provided a conclusion and a recommendation.

A series of plans, photographs and visual information were presented to complement the report.

In conclusion it was considered that any adverse impacts could be adequately mitigated by way of conditions and as there were no material planning considerations to warrant refusal, it was recommended that the application be granted.

Members undertook a discussion of the application and the following issues and points were raised:-

- ◆ A Member noted that the applicant had already begun work on Phase 1 of the site and asked whether there were any penalties that could be imposed in relation to commencing work before planning permission was in place. The representative of the Head of Planning Services outlined the particular circumstances in relation to the commencement of work on the site, but noted, should the application be refused, the applicant was aware that the land would have to be reinstated to its original condition.
- ◆ A Member referred to the presentation which had provided photographs of the access road to the site. He noted that these highlighted the existing condition of the access road, for the process that was already taking place on site and suggested that this was not meeting the conditions outlined in the report in terms of keeping the highway clean and safe. He considered that the area should be subject to enhanced checks to ensure compliance with the conditions, should Members be minded to approve the application. The representative of the Head of Planning Services stated that the site was monitored, and would continue to be so, to ensure compliance with the conditions.
- ◆ It was clarified that a mobile processing plant was operational within the application site. A Member noted that there was only one building for the workforce on the site and suggested that further consideration was required in relation to that, in line with the proposed extension of the quarry.
- ◆ A Member raised concerns regarding the loss of best quality agricultural land, through the application, and emphasised the need to maintain this type of agricultural land wherever possible.
- ◆ A number of Members stated that the application was only the subject of objections from one objector and were concerned that the matter had come before Committee for consideration, in view of that, particularly, when, in some of the Members' consideration, a number of the objections could be deemed to be frivolous. In response it was noted that, in line with the Constitution, applications that received objections had to be considered by the Committee. The Head of Planning Services noted that consideration was being given to possible changes to the Constitution, to allow issues to be addressed through the Scheme of Delegation, where there were few objections. Another Member considered that the objections raised were valid and that it was right and proper that the Committee considered the application.
- ◆ A Member of the Committee, also local Member for where the application site was located, noted that he had received no complaints regarding the existing operation on the site and that the application was supported by the local Parish Council.

**Resolved -**

That the application be approved for the reasons stated within the report and subject to the conditions outlined.

- 222. C3/16/01918/CPO – (NY/2016/0194/ENV) - Members Site Visit - Erection of a Green Energy Facility (6,342 sq. metres) (energy from waste via gasification), office reception building (91 sq. metres), substation and switchroom (39 sq. metres), air cooled condenser (195 sq. metres), installation of a weighbridge, earthworks, 20 car parking spaces, extension to internal access road, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including a local connection via underground cable (340 metres) to the 11kV grid via a proposed substation at land south of Knapton Quarry/Landfill as well as an underground connection (Option 1: 5.26 km and Option 2: 8.25 km) to the 66kV grid via the primary substation at Yedingham**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to consider a recommendation for a site visit in respect of a planning application relating to the above.

Members were advised that the report was not the substantive report for the determination of the planning application, but enabled Members to be appraised of the detail of the application, the outcome of consultation and the public engagement. This would facilitate Members' understanding of the application in advance of any potential site visit should Members resolve to undertake such a visit prior to any subsequent determination of the application.

As the application was the subject of unresolved objections the application would be brought before Members of the Committee for determination at a future meeting.

A summary of the objections received was contained within the interim report.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services provided a brief outline of the proposal to enable Members to determine whether a site visit was required.

As an update to the report it was noted that the local Member, County Councillor Sanderson, had responded outlining her support for the site visit and her wish to attend the visit should that be agreed to.

**Resolved -**

That the Committee agree to undertake a formal Committee site visit prior to the determination of the application, with arrangements made for the visit to take place at 10 am on Tuesday 28 February 2017.

- 223. C6/16/05274/CMA - (NY/2016/0237/73A) - Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 3408 (131 sq. metres) for a further 6 years at Ripon Grammar School, Clothholme Road, Ripon**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine the planning application for the retention of a prefabricated classroom unit 3408 (131 sq. metres) for a further six years on land at Ripon Grammar School, Clothholme Road, Ripon.

NYCC Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee - Minutes - 7 February 2017/3

The application was subject to an objection having been raised by Ripon City Council on the grounds of the time period the unit had been in situ, the justification of the need for the unit and that the prefabricated structure did not fit well into the landscape within the historic landscape of Ripon. The application was reported to the Committee for determination therefore.

A representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the report, highlighting the proposal; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; planning considerations; together with the conclusion and recommendation.

A series of plans, photographs and visual information was presented to complement the report.

In conclusion it was stated that there was no material planning considerations to warrant refusal of the application for the retention of the prefabricated classroom, however, in line with the objections submitted by Ripon City Council, it was suggested that the time period for the approval be for a further three years, rather than for a further six years.

Members discussed the application and the following points were raised during that discussion:-

- ◆ A Member noted that there was a clear policy, with regards to the retention of prefabricated classroom units, that these would be provided with a further six years of use, where applications were deemed to be appropriate. Members considered that the need for the unit had been proven and that the location was satisfactory.

**Resolved -**

That the application be approved for a period of six years for the reasons stated within the report and subject to the conditions outlined.

**224. (C6/16/03119/CMA – (NY/2016/0129/FUL) - Erection of a steel storage container (8 sq. metres) at Willow Tree CP School, Wetherby Road, Harrogate**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine a planning application for the erection of a steel storage container (8 sq. metres) on land at Willow Tree CP School, Wetherby Road, Harrogate.

The application was subject to an objection from the local planning authority (Harrogate Borough Council) on the grounds of design and cumulative impact of multiple units on site and was, therefore, reported to the Committee for determination.

A representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the report, highlighting the proposal; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; the planning considerations; together with the conclusion and recommendation.

In conclusion it was stated that there were no material planning considerations to warrant the refusal of the application for the erection of the steel storage container and therefore it was recommended that the application be approved.

During discussion of the application it was clarified for Members, through photographic



evidence, the nature of the steel storage unit and it was noted that it would be used to store sports equipment.

**Resolved -**

That the application be approved for the reasons stated within the report and subject to the conditions outlined.

**225. Items dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services outlining the items dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation between the period 14 November 2016 to 8 January 2017 inclusive.

The Head of Planning Services noted that applications NY/2016/0216/A27, NY/2016/0198/A27 and NY/2016/0179/A27 related to the approval of details reserved by condition in relation to the KMA Well site off Habton Road at Kirby Misperton and the Pickering 1 Well site, Malton Road, Pickering. In terms of the KMA Well site it was noted that there were still 7- 8 conditions to be developed.

**Resolved -**

That the report be noted.

**226. Publication by Local Authorities of Information about the Handling of Planning Applications**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services outlining the County Council's performance in handling of "County Matter" and County Council development planning applications for Quarter 3 (the period 1 October 2016 to 31 December 2016).

Information on enforcement cases was also attached as an Appendix to the report.

The Head of Planning Services provided an update on the list of all County Matter planning applications, in hand for more than 13 weeks and awaiting decision, as at the end of Quarter 3. It was noted that where extensions of time had previously been agreed with applicants these could extend beyond the expiry date highlighted provided that further extensions of time were agreed with the applicant.

**Resolved -**

That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 10.55 am.

SL/JR

**NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATORY FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE**

**4 APRIL 2017**

**NY/2010/0356/ENV – PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE EXTRACTION AND PROCESSING OF SAND AND GRAVEL INCLUDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SITE ACCESS, CONVEYORS, BRIDGES, ASSOCIATED PLANT AND MACHINERY WITH RESTORATION TO AGRICULTURE, NATURE CONSERVATION AND WETLAND AT KILLERBY SAND AND GRAVEL QUARRY, KILLERBY, NORTH YORKSHIRE**

**Report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services**

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To determine a planning application for the extraction and processing of sand and gravel including the construction of a site access, conveyors, bridges, associated plant and machinery with restoration to agriculture, nature conservation and wetland on land at Killerby, to the south-east of Catterick on behalf of Tarmac Limited.
- 1.2 The application is subject to unresolved objections and, therefore, in accord with Schedule 4 of the County Council's adopted [Officers' Scheme of Delegation](#), it is brought before Members of this Committee for determination. Objections to the proposed development include matters relating to potential adverse impacts upon ecology, landscape and restoration, as well as flood risk and adverse impacts upon local residential amenity including noise and those relating to highway matters associated with the proposed development.
- 1.3 Members will recall receiving an Officer report on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2016 therein recommending that a formal Committee Site Visit be considered prior to the determination of the planning application. Upon Member resolution to visit the site of the application, which took place on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016, this report now provided the substantive Officer report upon which to determine the planning application.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

Context

- 2.1 The application site is a 'greenfield' site currently laid to agricultural use. Its immediate environs include, progressing along points of the compass starting

to the immediate north-east, Kiplin Hall and Kiplin Park; to the east, but a little distance further, lies the village of Great Langton (approximately a kilometre straight-line distance); just over a kilometre, straight-line distance to the south-east lies the villages of Kirkby Fleetham, Great Fencote and Little Fencote; to the immediate south lie a number of individual properties, namely, Broad Close, Hook House Farm, Glebe Farm and, further south, Fleetham Lodge and Melton House; to the immediate west of the application site lies the north-south aligned A1 Motorway (with the village of Hackforth due south-south-west and East Appleton to the west again beyond the A1(M)) and, to the north-west, lie the Ministry of Defence land holdings at Catterick and beyond that lies Catterick village itself (a kilometre distant); north-north-west lie the villages of Ellerton and Bolton-on-Swale beyond. The application is accompanied by a '[Site Location](#)' plan (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 1, dated July 2010).

- 2.2 The A1 Trunk Road (T) flanks the western boundary of the application site. The A1(T) is an 'A' class road for the section in proximity of the application site. However, it is important to note that the A1(T) is currently being upgraded to motorway standard as part of the planned improvement works under the control of Highways England (formerly known as the Highways Agency). The former A1(T) road will become the Local Access Road, which will link the proposed application site on Low Street to the new A1(M) via a new central junction, located at Catterick, which will provide access to both the north and southbound carriageways.
- 2.3 Within a 3.5 km radius of the application site, the applicant company, Tarmac Limited, holds other interests. Firstly, the afore-mentioned Ellerton Quarry. This lies across the River Swale to the north of the proposed site in this current planning application. Ellerton Quarry is an established part-worked sand and gravel quarry also operated by Tarmac Limited<sup>1</sup>; although not currently operational. An application to determine a suite of modern planning conditions under the first Periodic Review of Old Mineral Permission (ROMP) ref. no. [C1/21/28/PA](#) dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1994 (ref. no. [NY/2010/0083/MRP](#)) currently remains to be determined by the County Planning Authority. Prior to the cessation of working, the operational arrangement in place was one of extracting sand and gravel from within the Ellerton Quarry site and transporting the mineral by conveyor to the neighbouring Kiplin Hall Quarry for processing.
- 2.4 The information accompanying the aforementioned ROMP application for Ellerton Quarry explains that the applicant company has permission for the processing of material (extracted from Ellerton Quarry) at Kiplin Hall Quarry (ref. no. [NY/2012/0159/73](#)) until 4<sup>th</sup> June 2017. It is important to clarify that, as part of the proposed development within the current planning application,

---

<sup>1</sup> The existing Ellerton Quarry has operated under lease by Tarmac Limited who took over the lease of Ellerton Quarry from Ennemix on 19<sup>th</sup> December 1994. However, it is understood that the quarry has not been worked to any significantly material degree since 2009; in the main due to the economic recession.

the extracted sand and gravels from the unworked phases at Ellerton Quarry are proposed to be transported by conveyor to the proposed Killerby Quarry site for processing. The applicant company considers that it would take approximately four to five years to process the remaining reserves of sand and gravel arising from the Ellerton Quarry site and that this would, therefore, extend the processing plant operations at the proposed Killerby Quarry site by approximately five years. Therefore, the proposed Killerby Quarry site would be operational for twenty-two and a half years in total.

- 2.5 The second of the applicant company's landholdings in the vicinity of the proposed site is Scorton Quarry which lies further north, beyond the Ellerton Quarry site, between the villages of Brompton-on-Swale and Bolton-on-Swale, along the east-west aligned B6271 to the north of Catterick where the west-to-east flowing River Swale turns southward towards its confluence with the River Ure. The application, as submitted, pre-supposes the implementation of the proposals prior to the closure of the Scorton Quarry site to enable a continuous supply of reserves in the area. Members' attention is drawn to the submission of a planning application (made on behalf of Tarmac Limited; also the applicant company in this current case) seeking the continuation of sand and gravel extraction operations at Scorton Quarry for a further four years until the end of 2020.
- 2.6 The applicant company proposes to relocate the existing processing plant used at the Scorton Quarry site for use at the proposed Killerby Quarry, with the aim of production from the proposed Killerby Quarry site commencing in 2020/21. The applicant company confirms that the advantage this timing strategy is that it would remove vehicle traffic from the local road network around Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton, as vehicles travelling to and from the proposed quarry would exit the quarry entrance and be directed to the A1 Trunk Road (T)<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.7 The relationships between the current proposal and the existing minerals-related developments in the area, in terms of the potential for cumulative environmental effects is considered within Section 7.0 of this Committee Report.
- 2.8 In summary, specifically concerning the application site itself, the applicant company has applied for the extraction of approximately 11.37 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of approximately 17.5 years, with a production rate of 650,000 tonnes per annum from the application site. While the application site encompassing the land required for the proposed development amounts to approximately 213 hectares (2.13km<sup>2</sup>), the proposed area of mineral extraction amounts to approximately 114 hectares (1.14km<sup>2</sup>).

---

<sup>2</sup> Highways England are currently implementing the Leeming to Barton A1 improvement scheme, which involves upgrading the existing A1 Trunk Road to motorway standard, and will result in certain sections of the existing carriageway being transformed and used as Local Access Roads, merging with the new A1 (M).

- 2.9 The proposed extraction of the mineral is divided up into three areas of planned working, namely '*Killerby West*', '*Killerby East*' and '*Killerby South*', and is proposed to be processed within a dedicated plant area within '*Killerby South*' of the application site, as illustrated on the submitted application drawing '[Phasing Plan – Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).
- 2.10 The phasing of the proposed development, in summary, would initially see the formation of the access, weighbridge, conveyor routes, two bridges over the River Swale, screening bunds and the first of the silt lagoons as well as mineral working within the central area of the application site (i.e. within '*Killerby South*'), advance tree planting, the formation of the processing plant area and working in Phase 1A (what is referred to by the applicant company as the '*Establishment Phase*') and comprising 5.9 hectares of land.
- 2.11 Upon the establishment of the plant within the proposed Killerby Quarry site, the applicant company proposes that sand and gravel would be brought by conveyor over the River Swale (across a temporary bridge) from the former Ellerton Quarry workings and processed through the newly constructed plant at the proposed Killerby Quarry site. Members' attention is drawn to the visual representation of the proposed development provided by application drawing '[Phasing Plan - Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015). It should be noted that reference on the plan to '*Ellerton Quarry Phases 7-10*' relates to those reserves remaining within the former Ellerton Quarry workings (permission for which remains extant). The processing of the remaining reserves from the former Ellerton Quarry site (in effect forming Phase 1C of the current application proposals) has been estimated by the applicant company to constitute a working duration of approximately four years. The reserves within the former Ellerton Quarry have also been estimated by the applicant company to be 3.25 million tonnes.
- 2.12 Mineral working is proposed to then move into what has been referred to within the application as '*Killerby West*' that comprises Phases 2A (4.4 hectares), 2B (5.1 hectares), and 2C (4.3 hectares) (Phase 2C would constitute the final phase of any mineral working within the '*Killerby West*' area) while continuing working within the '*Killerby South*' area. Phases 3A, 3B and 4A are proposed to be worked before '*breaking into*' the '*Killerby East*' area. The '*Killerby East*' area is proposed to comprise Phases 4B, 4C, 4D and 4E. Finally, Phases 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D would all occur within the '*Killerby South*' area of the application site.
- 2.13 The final phase of the proposed development (in effect, Phase 6) would see any remaining mineral reserve below the conveyor route and plant site extracted, the removal of the plant site and the restoration of the final remaining areas. The restoration proposals for the site comprise a

combination of agriculture, nature conservation and wetland and has been illustrated on the applicant company's submitted ['Restoration Masterplan'](#) (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016).

- 2.14 The application site is accessed via an existing agricultural farm gate off Low Street.

Constraints affecting the application site

- 2.15 From a landscape perspective, the application site and surrounding area fall within the [National Character Area \(NCA\) profile 24, the 'Vale of Mowbray'](#). There are 159 NCAs in England. Some of the key characteristics of this NCA include low-lying, gently undulating landscape, a mixed agricultural landscape of arable and grassland, where woodland and tree cover is sparse. It comprises "*undulating flood plains associated with the rivers Swale, Wiske and Cod Beck*", "*is framed by the uplands of the Pennines to the west and the North York Moors to the east*" and "*overlies the Sherwood Sandstone aquifer, the second largest aquifer in England and a major drinking water supply*" (source: [www.naturalengland.org.uk](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk)). A number of the fields within and adjacent to the application site are divided by hedgerows with mature hedgerow trees which provide natural screening in certain areas. "*The site supports a mosaic of arable farmland, pastoral grasslands, mature hedgerow, mixed plantation, scattered mature trees, wet woodland, small watercourses, wet grassland and tall ruderal habitats*" (source: [North Yorkshire Joint Minerals & Waste Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal - Assessment of Sites](#))
- 2.16 Other environmental designations includes a strip of ancient woodland, approximately 150 metres to the east of the application boundary around the '*Killerby East*' area at its closest point.
- 2.17 The applicant company's submission explains that the proposed mineral extraction operations would result in a temporary loss of approximately 136.9 hectares (1.369 km<sup>2</sup>) of agricultural land; of which approximately 83.7 hectares (0.837 km<sup>2</sup>) is categorised as '*best and most versatile*' (BMV) agricultural land (as defined in [Annex 2](#) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)). The proposals as submitted would involve the permanent loss of 57.4 hectares (0.547 km<sup>2</sup>) of agricultural land; of which 29.5 hectares (0.295 km<sup>2</sup>) is categorised as '*best and most versatile*' land.
- 2.18 In terms of ecological considerations, the '*River Swale Great Langton to Kiplin*' Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) (a locally designated site) encroaches within the northern boundary of the application site, affecting both areas of '*Killerby West*' and '*Killerby East*' as shown on the applicant company's submitted '[Phasing Plan - Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015). Other locally-designed SINC's namely '*Park Plantation*', '*Great Langton Pond*' and '*Kirkby Wood*' lie 1.21 km, 1.56 km and 1.25km respectively.

- 2.19 A nationally designated site for nature conservation (designated by Natural England under the provisions of Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)), the '[Swale Lakes' Site of Special Scientific Interest](#) (SSSI), is situated circa 0.5km to the north of the application site. This site, covering an area of 42.5 hectares, is of interest for *"its diverse population of breeding birds and large numbers of wintering wildfowl and waders"* (source: [www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk](http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk)).
- 2.20 In terms of the water environment, while the application site lies neither within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) or a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ), it does, however, lie approximately 40 metres west of a Source Protection Zone 3. Upon review of the Environment Agency's online Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZ) mapping system the site falls outside of any SPZs. However, immediately north east of the application site is a zone 3<sup>3</sup> catchment area. Again using the Environment Agency's Aquifer Maps online mapping system, the application site falls both within a Principal Aquifer<sup>4</sup> and within a Secondary Aquifer area<sup>5</sup>. In terms of groundwater vulnerability, according to the Environment Agency's online mapping system, the majority of the western and southern parts of the application site fall within a Minor Aquifer High area. The majority of the eastern part of the application site falls within a Minor Aquifer Intermediate area. The entire application site also falls within a surface water safeguard zone<sup>6</sup>.
- 2.21 The River Swale is the largest watercourse within proximity of the application site, and as noted above, part of the River Swale is designated as a SINC. A series of ditches and small watercourses also run across parts of the application site, the largest of which is Fiddale Beck.
- 2.22 According to the Environment Agency's (EA) online Flood Map, parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The northern part of the site, both south and north of the River Swale is within Flood Zone 3, and is considered to form part of the functional floodplain, which is land where water has to flow or be stored. Other parts of the application site, to the east and in and around Killerby Hall fall within Flood Zone 2.
- 2.23 In terms of cultural heritage receptors, there are a number of [listed buildings](#) within close proximity to the application site and these have been mapped by

---

<sup>3</sup> The Environment Agency confirm that that this is defined as the area around a source within which all groundwater recharge is presumed to be discharged at the source.

<sup>4</sup> The Environment Agency confirm that this is an aquifer type, which forms an important source of base flow to rivers.

<sup>5</sup> These include a wide range of rock layers or drift deposits with a wide range of water permeability and storage.

<sup>6</sup> According to the Environment Agency, drinking water safeguard zones are designated areas in which the use of certain substances must be carefully managed to prevent the pollution of raw water sources that are used to provide drinking water.

the applicant company on its originally submitted application drawing '[Sensitive Receptors](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 4.2, dated July 2010). Immediately adjacent to the application site lies Killerby Hall; the stables of which are listed. To the north-west of the application site is Oran house which is a Grade II listed building. To the north-east of the application site, adjacent to Ellerton Quarry is the Jacobean historic house of the Grade I listed building, Kiplin Hall and to the east of the application site is situated Hook Car Hill Farmhouse which is a Grade II listed building. There are also three [Scheduled Ancient Monuments](#) (SAMs) within or less than circa 0.5km.

- 2.24 A Public Right of Way (PRoWs) (a footpath) traverses across the centre of the application site on a south-east/north-west alignment from its connection to the public highway of Lumley Lane, travelling north-west to Broad Close Farm and then on toward Killerby Hall. Another PRoW (also a footpath) skirts the application site southern boundary and for a short distance lies immediately adjacent. This second public footpath is aligned south-west/north-east and links Low Street, through the land holding of Hook House Farm and north-east toward Kirkby Fleetham Hall. Part of the [National Cycle Route \(no.71\)](#) (which makes part of the route between Kirby Knowle on the western edge of the North York Moors National Park through Northallerton, onto Leyburn and the up to the northern stretches of the Yorkshire Dales National Park near Tan Hill Inn) comes within approximately 1.5 kilometres of the application site connecting the villages of Great Langton, before turning south through Kirkby Fleetham and toward the villages of Great and Little Fencote (source: [www.sustrans.org.uk](http://www.sustrans.org.uk)).
- 2.25 In terms of utilities (i.e. services consumed by the public such as electricity, gas, water, sewerage and telecommunications), a gas pipeline owned by Northern Gas Networks runs in a west/east alignment through the application site (including some of the planned phased working areas); the route of which has been shown on the applicant company's submitted plans, namely the '[Topographical Survey](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 2.3 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015)). Northern Gas Networks have confirmed that the pipeline is covered by two easements, both possessing a width of 20 metres from the centre of the pipeline. Both easements are linked with mining clauses. The applicant company confirms that consultation would be carried out with the gas distributor to remove and relocate the gas pipeline in advance of any working.
- 2.26 An existing water main also falls within the application site. The water main, which is owned by Yorkshire Water Services Limited, is up to 4 inches in diameter. It is important to clarify that the applicant company does not intend to remove the water main as it falls outside of the areas proposed for mineral extraction.



- 2.27 It is also important to note that there are a number of overhead power cables running through the application site. The applicant company confirms that the appropriate notice would be served to Yorkshire Electricity Distribution Ltd (YEDL) and National Grid Transco and the power cables would be diverted as necessary.
- 2.28 The proposed site subject to this application is also located within an area notified as an '[Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone](#)' for RAF Leeming.
- 2.29 There are a number of residential properties and agricultural buildings not only within close proximity but also within the boundary of the application site itself. The distance of '*close proximity*' has been taken to be '*level-distance*' as opposed to '*visual-distance*' relating to the topography of the surrounding land. These properties include:
- the property of *Broad Close Farm* which lies within the centre of the application site;
  - *Killerby Hall* and *Hall Cottages*, *The Springs*, *The Bungalow* and *Killerby Farm* which are the closest residential properties to the '*Killerby West*' area of planned mineral working (Phases 2A (part), 2B, and 2C) being situated immediately south of this particular area;
  - the properties of *Pike Hill*, *West Lodge* (circa 50 metres north-west), *Broad Close Cottages*, *Glebe Cottage*, *Glebe Farm*, *Bridge Close Cottage* (off Low Street) and *Hook House Farm* (off Planetree Lane) all lie proximate to the boundary of the proposed '*Killerby South*' area (comprising Phases 1A, 2A (part), 3A, 3B, 4A, 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D); and,
  - the property of *Hook Car Hill Farmhouse* lies circa 190 metres to the east of the area of proposed mineral working referred to by the applicant company as '*Killerby East*' which comprises Phases 4B, 4C, 4D and 4E of the proposed development.

#### Planning History

- 2.30 This sub-section outlines the relevant planning history for the application site. It is important to note that the applications found as part of this search relate to the former Ellerton Quarry workings which overlap with the current application site and the adjacent former Kiplin Hall Quarry, which has also been included due to its link with the Ellerton Quarry site as explained earlier herein this report. The search results comprise in order of the oldest to the most recent:
- 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1994 – permission for the extraction of gravel at the Ellerton Quarry site (also known as Manor Farm) (ref. no. [C1/21/28/PA](#));
  - 16<sup>th</sup> September 1996 – permission for the establishment of a field conveyor between Ellerton Quarry and Kiplin Hall Quarry to transport sand and gravel from Ellerton Quarry for processing at Kiplin Hall Quarry (ref. no.s [C1/12/16/PA](#) / [C2/87/081/003](#) (straddling both the districts of Richmondshire and Hambleton));

- 28<sup>th</sup> July 2010 - [Scoping Opinion](#) for a proposed sand and gravel quarry at Killerby issued (ref. no. [NY/2009/0320/SCO](#));
- 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2010 - application for first periodic review of old mineral permission ref. no. C1/21/28/PA dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1994 at Ellerton Quarry is associated with the current submission and remains to be determined application (ref. no. [NY/2010/0083/MRP](#)); and,
- 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2010 - Scoping Opinion issued in relation to the proposed Review of Mineral Permission for gravel extraction from Ellerton Quarry (ref. no. [NY/2009/0429/SCO](#)).

#### Directions of the Secretary of State for Transport

- 2.31 This particular application has been the subject of formal Directions from the Secretary of State for Transport between 2010 and 2014 which prohibited the Authority from determining the planning application until such time as it had received no further Direction.
- 2.32 The first of these Directions, dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 2010, prohibited any determination within six months, and was dependent upon the resolution of outstanding technical matters in connection with the A1 Leeming to Barton (A1L2B) Motorway Upgrade Scheme.
- 2.33 On 7<sup>th</sup> November 2014, the County Planning Authority received final notification from the Secretary of State that it no longer held the Direction in place and that the Authority was at liberty to proceed to determine the application. However, within this intervening period of over four years, the circumstances and the context of the application changed considerably. By way of example, the iteration of government policy through the publication of the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) in March of 2012 and, two years later, the introduction of the online resource of national guidance in March 2014 with the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#).

### 3.0 **THE PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 This application (ref. no. [NY/2010/0356/ENV](#)) proposes the extraction and processing of approximately 11.37 million tonnes of sand and gravel over 17.5 years (at a rate of extraction of 650,000 tonnes per annum), including associated development. The area subject to the application amounts to 213 hectares. (2.13 square kilometres) with the area of proposed extraction amounting to 122 hectares (1.2 square kilometres). Members' attention is drawn to the fact that during the processing of this application, the applicant company has amended the proposals to withdraw an element of the scheme (Phase 1B) which had been intended for the extraction of clay for the lining of a lagoon within Phase 1A and works associated with the A1(M) upgrade works. The area of extraction has also been re-calculated and now the applicant company proposes the total area of extraction to be reduced by eight

hectares down to 114 hectares. Similarly, reappraisal of the proposals during the processing of the application has seen a change from the originally estimated 16 year life to the now proposed 17.5 years. The extraction of the mineral is proposed to take place to a maximum depth of 17.7 metres (just over 58 feet). While the proposals seek to extract mineral from the application site as well as processing the mineral on site, they also include processing sand and gravel extracted from the existing adjacent Ellerton Quarry (overlapping the northern boundary of the application site) and is shown on the submitted documents accompanying the application on the plan entitled '[Planning Application Boundary](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 2.1 rev A, dated March 2015) (as shown at Appendix A to this report). The applicant company has estimated it could take approximately five years to process the remaining 3.25 million tonnes of Ellerton sand and gravel and therefore the overall development within the current proposal would take place over a duration of twenty years operational development.

- 3.2 In addition to seeking planning permission for the extraction and processing of sand and gravel, the applicant company is also applying for the construction of a new site access, the construction and decommissioning of a conveyor system with two conveyor bridges, a processing plant area and the progressive restoration of the site to a combined agriculture, nature conservation and wetland after-use.
- 3.3 The applicant company states that the proposed development would support twenty plus direct jobs, along with indirect employment opportunities in terms of "*hauliers and many suppliers*".

#### Mineral Extraction Scheme

- 3.4 As introduced within Section 2.0 of this report, the proposed site at Killerby has been divided into three principal mineral working areas, namely '*Killerby West*', '*Killerby East*' and '*Killerby South*', which are sub-divided into the main extraction Phases 1 through to Phase 5 and then further sub-divided to indicate the active areas, direction of working and subsequent restoration. The planned comprehensive phasing of the application site is set out on the plan accompanying the application entitled '[Phasing Plan - Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).
- 3.5 Also illustrated on the aforementioned drawing is the location of the sub-divisions of the proposed '*active*' areas, which are divided into 16 sub-phases, comprising: 1A (part in '*Killerby West*'); 1C (Ellerton Quarry (Phases 7-10); 2A (part); 2B; 2C (known as '*Killerby West*'); 3A; 3B; 5A; 5B; 5C and 5D (known as '*Killerby South*') and 4A; 4B; 4C; 4D; 4E (known as '*Killerby East*'). It should be noted that annotation on the Plan referring to '*Ellerton Quarry Phases 7-10*' relates to the phases approved under the planning permission for Ellerton Quarry and do not form part of the area of this current application

relating to the proposed Killerby site with the exception of the area of land required for the purpose of river crossing.

#### Phasing of extraction and processing

- 3.6 The proposed phases of development consist of what the applicant company has referred to as the '*Establishment Phase*', the '*Operational Phase*' (Phases 1 to 5), the phase involving the removal of the Plant Site and the phase involving the completion of the progressive restoration and associated aftercare (Phase 6).

#### *The Establishment Phase*

- 3.7 This phase would consist of the establishment of the processing plant, construction of the site accommodation, access road, weighbridge, conveyor routes, two river crossings (i.e. bridges) over the River Swale and initial silt lagoons as illustrated on the drawing accompanying the application, '[Phasing Plan – Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).
- 3.8 The bridges are proposed to be single-span structures of some three metres in width so as to accommodate the conveyors and allow safe access for maintenance purposes. The first bridge is proposed to connect the area referred to as '*Killerby West*' with the former Ellerton Quarry on the north side of the river and the second is proposed to connect Ellerton with the area referred to as '*Killerby East*'. The applicant company explains that the bridge abutments are proposed to be constructed five metres outside of the river channel of the Swale.
- 3.9 As described in the [revised Project Description](#) chapter of the Environmental Statement (submission made in February 2016), the proposed conveyor system would be used to transport extracted sand and gravel from the extraction point to the processing plant situated within the Plant Site. The conveyor system would comprise of spine conveyors with short-term field conveyors spurring off onto the extraction areas. The proposed conveyor would be placed on a hard-core standing, constructed from using materials obtained on site, or directly onto exposed mineral.
- 3.10 As explained in the [revised Project Description](#) section of the Environmental Statement (submission made in February 2016), the processing plant would be "*located in a central area where there are no recoverable mineral reserves and where it would be partially screened by the topography*". Subsoil stripped from the plant site area would be placed to the north of the plant site so as to act as a visual barrier mitigating the effects of the proposed development for those living in residential properties to the north of the proposed workings.
- 3.11 This initial '*Establishment Phase*' is proposed to include the development of nearly 9km of new bridleways and access paths; an example being a

proposed circular route taking in the perimeter around the area referred to as 'Killerby East'. However, closures and diversions of certain sections of the footpaths are required to enable the proposed development to be implemented. This includes the public footpath between Killerby Hall and Broadclose Farm.

- 3.12 The applicant company also proposes that the soils stripped from sub-Phase 1A would be stripped and stored separately. In addition, the silt lagoons in sub-Phase 1A would be created by excavating the sand and gravel.

*Phase 1*

- 3.13 Phase 1 includes the establishment of the internal access road, Plant Site, Office and Weighbridge as well as operational extraction, transportation and processing of sand and gravel. The originally submitted application in July 2010 proposed three sub-phases within Phase 1.

- 3.14 With the revised route for the A1 upgrade to motorway standard being confirmed as following the southbound carriageway of the former A1(T), works are no longer planned for sub-Phase 1B. Therefore, sub-Phase 1B has been removed from the applicant company's revised description of development as set out in the [revised ES Chapter 3 – Project Description](#) (submission made in February 2016).

- 3.15 As explained within the [Project Description](#) of the Environmental Statement (submission made in February 2016), sub -Phase 1A (5.9 ha.) is situated within the proposed area referred to as 'Killerby South', and sub-Phase 1C comprises the extraction of mineral which lies within the former Ellerton Quarry. From here, unprocessed extracted mineral is proposed to be transported by conveyor over the first of the river crossings (for the purpose of this report, referred to herein as the 'east bridge') to the proposed Killerby site (the subject area of this current proposal). The silt lagoons created in the 'Establishment Phase' would be used in the processing of mineral extracted during Phase 1. Extracted mineral would be transported on a conveyor to the processing plant located within the Plant Site at Killerby. Once sub-Phase 1A is completed, sand and gravel brought from Ellerton Quarry would be processed as part of sub-Phase 1C of the proposed development.

- 3.16 As is illustrated in the accompanying '[Phasing Plan – Phase 1](#)' (Drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.3 Rev A, dated March 2015), Phase 1 of the proposed development involves the closure and diversion of an existing public footpath, taking it around the proposed Plant Site and re-joining to the north of sub-Phase 1A.

*Phase 2*

- 3.17 The proposed second phase of extraction is proposed to be worked in an anti-clockwise direction and covers 18.1 hectares. This is further sub-divided down

into three sub-phases which comprise sub-Phases 2A (4.4 ha.) which is closest to the River Swale, 2B (5.1 ha.) and 2C (4.3ha.) located in the area referred to within the application as *'Killerby West'*.

- 3.18 In taking into account that sub-Phase 2A is the closest to the River Swale, the applicant company acknowledges that this section of the river bank is subject to active erosion. Thus, so as to prevent the river from *'breaking through'* into the area of proposed mineral extraction operations especially once the workings are complete and restored to a lake, *"suitable material would be placed to reinforce the north eastern boundary"*.
- 3.19 The [revised Project Description](#) section of the Environmental Statement (submission made in February 2016) explains that the soils stripped from sub-Phase 2A would be stored in soil storage bunds to the east of the area referred to within the application as *'Killerby South'* as illustrated on the plan accompanying the application entitled ['Phasing Plan – Phase 2'](#) – (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 8, Rev A, dated March 2015).
- 3.20 During this planned phase of works, a second river crossing (for the purpose of this report herein referred to as the *'west bridge'*) is proposed to be constructed over which mineral would be transported to the mineral processing plant from the area known as *'Killerby West'* crossing over to the former Ellerton Quarry and then crossing back over the river through the area referred to as *'Killerby East'* and on toward the processing plant.
- 3.21 The application details explain that it is intended that sub-Phase 2A would be extracted and subsequently prepared to provide silt lagoons in connection with the extraction of mineral from sub-Phases 2A, 2B and 2C. The soils stripped from *'Killerby West'* would be stored in soil bunds to the east of the extraction area.
- 3.22 Extraction is proposed to then proceed within the eastern and northern sections of *'Killerby West'*, closest to the River Swale. The applicant company, as earlier referred, also proposes that material would be placed to reinforce the north-eastern boundary to prevent the river from *'breaking through'* into the planned restoration lake (for the purpose of this report herein referred to as the *'west bridge'*)<sup>7</sup>.
- 3.23 Extracted mineral from within this second phase is proposed to be transported for processing at the Plant Site via the conveyor. Extraction is proposed to then resume in the area referred to as *'Killerby South'* *"to create additional lagoon space"*. During Phase 2, progressive restoration is proposed to be in progress in sub-Phase 1A with the filling of silt lagoons, drying out and

---

<sup>7</sup> Three lakes are proposed as part of the scheme-wide restoration as illustrated on ['Restoration Masterplan'](#) (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016)

capping, as illustrated on the drawing accompanying the application '[Phasing Plan – Phase 2](#)' – (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 8, Rev A, dated March 2015).

#### *Phase 3*

- 3.24 Phase 3 is divided into two sub-phases and covers 10.6 hectares. The soils stripped from sub-Phases 3A (3.9 ha.) and 3B (6.7 ha.) are proposed to be stored in soil storage bunds to the east of the extraction area. The [revised Project Description](#) of the ES (submission made in February 2016) clarifies that extraction would commence in sub-Phase 3A, working in a west-to-east direction toward sub-Phase 3B. During the progression of Phase 3, Phase 1 would, the Applicant company anticipates, have been fully restored and a permanent lake ('*west lake*') would have been created in the area referred to as '*Killerby West*' as a result of the progressive restoration. The applicant company also describes how by this stage of the development, the '*west bridge*', being no longer of any need, would have been removed. As illustrated on the plan accompanying the application '[Phasing Plan – Phase 3](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.5, Rev A, dated March 2015), it is proposed that restoration would progress within sub-Phase 2A during this third phase of works.

#### *Phase 4*

- 3.25 Phase 4 of the proposed development has been divided by the applicant company into five sub-Phases comprising 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D and 4E. The soils that would be stripped from sub-Phase 4A would be stored in bunds. As explained within the [revised Project Description](#) section of the ES (submission made in February 2016), the applicant company considers that these bunds would act as visual mitigation for those living in nearby residential properties to the south of the application site. Sand and gravel extraction is proposed to commence in sub-Phase 4A and the mineral is proposed to be transported to the plant site via a conveyor. Extraction within sub-Phase 4A would be undertaken in two layers. The applicant company explains that soils would then be stripped from remaining sub-Phases 4B to 4E (within the area referred to as '*Killerby East*') and would be stored in soil storage bunds (Bund no.s 16 and 17) to the south. During Phase 4, sub-Phase 3A would have been fully restored to grassland and part of a lake (for the purpose of this report referred to herein as '*south lake*'). Progressive restoration would have commenced within sub-Phase 3B with the filling in of the silt lagoons. This progressive restoration is shown on the plan accompanying application entitled '[Phasing Plan – Phase 4](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.6 Rev A, dated March 2015)

#### *Phase 5*

- 3.26 The applicant company explains that during Phase 5, which covers a total extraction area of 35.4 hectares, would see the conveyor progressively dismantled, including the removal of the '*east bridge*' over the river, as the remaining sand and gravel is extracted, as would be the case for sub-Phases 5A (6.3 ha.), 5B (10.3 ha.), 5C (9.7 ha.) and 5D 9.1 ha.). The soils stripped

from sub-Phase 5A would then be used as part of the progressive restoration of sub-Phase 4A. The soils stripped from sub-Phases 5B & 5C are proposed to be used in the progressive restoration of previous phases within the application site.

- 3.27 As confirmed within the applicant company's [revised Project Description](#) of the ES (submission made in February 2016), "*the placement of silt lagoons has been targeted to allow silt to be placed in areas where the shallowest depth occurs between the restoration water level and the base of extraction*". The applicant company maintains that "*this would allow for the best use of waste materials in the restoration of the site, maximizing the creation of dry land or shallow water margins*".
- 3.28 It is important to note that Broad Close Farm would be demolished during this phase of the proposed development. An indicative location for the proposed new farmhouse is illustrated on the plan accompanying the application, the revised '[Restoration Masterplan](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016) and within the [revised Project Description](#) chapter of the ES (submission made in February 2016) confirms that a planning application for a new farm house and associated buildings would subsequently be made by the applicant company.
- 3.29 As explained within the [revised Project Description](#) section of the ES (submission made in February 2016), it is the intention of the applicant company to create a new landform "*appropriate to the area*". Soils stripped from sub-Phase 5D would also be used for the progressive restoration of previous phases. The applicant company maintains that the restoration of this phase "*would be partly aided by clays and other non-mineral material*". The phasing of this progressive restoration in relation to the application site is illustrated in the plan accompanying the application entitled '[Phasing Plan – Phase 5](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.7, rev A, dated March 2015).
- 3.30 It is also important to clarify that during Phase 5 of the proposed development, all of the previous phases would have been restored except for sub-Phase 4A.

#### *Phase 6*

##### *Removal of the Plant Site and Restoration*

- 3.31 During the final phase of the proposed development, the material from the remaining areas within the quarry, which would have previously been sterilised by the conveyor route and the eastern edge of the plant site would finally be extracted.
- 3.32 All of the plant within the Plant Site would be removed and access roads and other infrastructure, including remaining ground associated with the plant, would be restored. As explained within the [revised Project Description](#) of the ES (submission made in February 2016), all soils within the soil storage



mounds on site would have been used to assist in the progressive restoration of the application site.

Working method and water supply

- 3.33 The [revised Project Description](#) within the ES (submission made in February 2016) confirms that the main processing plant on site would be similar in type and capacity to that operated at Scorton Quarry, which the applicant company maintains could eventually be replaced by this proposed quarry. The proposed location of the Killerby Quarry Plant Site is located within the area referred to as 'Killerby South' and is illustrated on the plan accompanying application entitled '[Phasing Plan – Composite](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).
- 3.34 The applicant company states that the proposed quarry would be worked by a mixture of dry and wet working<sup>8</sup> as extraction of sand and gravel would sometimes occur below the water table. Where the mineral is situated below the water table it is proposed to extract it using one or two methods. It is important to note that the applicant company states that the direction of working has been designed to start at the lowest drainage point, working upwards through the ground water table to utilise passive lowering of the water table where possible.
- 3.35 The first method would be by using a backactor (i.e. excavating equipment consisting of a digging bucket on the end of a two-part articulated arm) where the extracted material would be deposited on dry sand and gravel, allowing the water to drain before it is transported to the plant site. The second method would involve water from being pumped from created cells into the adjacent former workings where water would seep back into the sand and gravel. The applicant company states within the [revised Project Description](#) section of the ES (submission made in February 2016) that the main reason for these two proposed methods is to minimise the impact of the proposed operations upon the existing water environment.
- 3.36 The applicant company also confirms that the proposed development would reduce the amount of existing groundwater storage on site due to the removal of sand and gravel in which groundwater is stored. However, the applicant company considers that this *“loss of groundwater storage would be offset by the presence of water bodies within the restoration landform”*.
- 3.37 Furthermore, the [revised Project Description](#) within the ES (submission made in February 2016) confirms that the extracted mineral would be transported to the nearest field conveyor by either a loading shovel or dump truck for onward movement by conveyor to the plant site.

---

<sup>8</sup> *“River gravels deposits, by their nature, are often below the ground water table. Extraction therefore usually involves dewatering the site by pumping, although sometimes it is feasible to work the site wet. Dry working has the advantage that it allows more selective extraction. Some bedrock sands may also be worked below the water table”*. (BGS Mineral Planning Factsheet, June 2013)

- 3.38 The applicant company states that the extracted sand and gravel “*would be graded by crushing, screening and washing, with the silt being removed in the washing process*”. Settlement lagoons would be constructed to allow ‘*washed-out*’ silt (from the sand and gravel) to be detached from the water. The applicant company explains within the [revised Project Description](#) chapter within the revised project description section of the ES (submission made in February 2016) that the location of the silt lagoons are targeted at areas where the shallowest depth of mineral occurs between the base of extraction and the target restoration level. The applicant company also clarifies that the water from the lagoons would be reused for processing purposes in what the applicant company refers to as a “*closed loop system*”, although the applicant company admits that “*some additional water would be needed for topping up the supply*”. This additional water is proposed to be taken from passive dewatering operations.
- 3.39 From a hydrological perspective, the applicant company acknowledges that the proposed operations are likely to require the seeking of Environmental Permits issued by the Environment Agency, including a [Water Abstraction Licence](#), as well as a [Water Transfer Licence](#) to allow the movement of water around the application site, and also [Water Discharge Licence](#) to allow the control of the quality of water discharged off site.
- 3.40 The direction of the proposed working of the phases within the quarry is illustrated on the plan accompanying the application entitled ‘[Phasing Plan – Composite](#)’ (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.1 Rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015). The [revised Project Description](#) within the ES (submission made in February 2016) states that the applicant company has designed the direction of working to “*start at the lowest drainage point, working upwards through the ground water table to utilise passive lowering of the water table where possible*”. The applicant company explains that this would also result in any excess water “*being passively discharged off site*”.
- 3.41 The applicant company proposes that the extracted mineral from Ellerton Quarry would be processed on site at Killerby as part of extraction Phase 1. However, as explained by the applicant company in [revised Project Description](#) of the ES (submission made in February 2016), transporting the extracted mineral away from Ellerton to be processed at Killerby poses the question of how to transport extracted silt back across the River Swale for use in the restoration of Ellerton Quarry.
- 3.42 The applicant company has identified two options for undertaking this transportation activity and both options have been assessed in the [Water Resources Chapter](#) of the ES (July 2010). The first option involves silt being pumped back to Ellerton regularly. However, the applicant company explains that the required optimum water requirement is being investigated to ascertain

the viability of this silt transportation option. The second option involves the silt being settled within lagoons at Killerby “*then periodically moved back to Ellerton by slurry pumping*”. This option would result in a much lower amount of water being transferred from Killerby to the former Ellerton Quarry.

#### Highways and traffic

- 3.43 From a transport perspective, the access to the application site is proposed to be situated at a bend in the public highway at north end of Low Street west on Low Street. The vehicles associated with the development would be directed to and from the new Local Access Road. Furthermore, the [revised Project Description](#) within the Environmental Statement (submission made in February 2016) confirms that vehicle movements, both to and from, the proposed quarry would equate to 118 vehicles in and 118 vehicles out per day. The proposed vehicles to be used would include 20 tonnes payload Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). These proposed vehicle numbers are based on the premise that processing within Phase 1 of the extraction takes place at the proposed Killerby site instead of the former Ellerton Quarry. The applicant company also states that “*no quarry vehicles would travel south on Low Street*”.
- 3.44 The applicant company has provided a [draft S106 Legal Agreement](#) (explained in more detail below) in which there is an undertaking to “*institute a dedicated traffic route for all lorries and heavy goods vehicles serving the Development (...) to and from the local access road*”. In addition, the applicant company proposes to undertake to pay the County a contribution to the maintenance of Public Rights of Way upon adoption.

#### Operational Working Hours

- 3.45 The proposed hours of operation for this application are as follows:
- Mondays to Fridays 07.00 – 19.00; and
  - Saturdays 07.00 – 13.00.
- 3.46 No operations are proposed to take place on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

#### Agricultural Land

- 3.47 The proposed extraction of sand and gravel, followed by progressive restoration would result in the temporary disturbance of 136.9 hectares of agricultural land; of which approximately 83.7ha is classified as ‘[best and most versatile](#)’ (BMV) [agricultural land](#) (i.e. land of quality of Grade 3a or above). However, it is important to note that the ES (July 2010) confirms that soils would be removed and restored progressively. Therefore, “*at any one time the loss of agricultural land would be considerably less*”. As illustrated on the plan accompanying the application, the revised ‘[Restoration Masterplan](#)’ (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016), the applicant company

intends to restore 64.5 hectares of land back to agricultural land, which results in a gross loss of 57.4 hectares of agricultural land, of which 29.5 hectares is BMV land.

#### Progressive Restoration Scheme

- 3.48 The proposed restoration scheme for the application site has been designed such that the restored site would comprise of three lakes (Lake 1 ('west lake'), Lake 2 ('east lake') and Lake 3 ('south lake')) including alder/ willow carr (fen woodland or scrub), ponds and marshland, parkland, agricultural land, woodland, hedgerow, copses, public footpaths and bridleways.
- 3.49 The proposed restoration for the entire application site is illustrated on the revised '[Restoration Masterplan](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016). The phasing of the proposed restoration is proposed to take place continually during the extraction of other phases.
- 3.50 The applicant company has confirmed that the proposed restoration "*of the quarry would take place in a progressive manner alongside the phases of extraction*". The [revised Project Description](#) also confirms that it "*is proposed that soils and overburden that are stripped would wherever possible be used directly in restoration. The exception to the direct use of the soil resource would be where the construction of mounds are required, which would act as both visual and noise screening bunds, or where initial development does not create sufficient void for their immediate use*".
- 3.51 From an ecological perspective, the applicant company states that the "*findings of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey (see ES chapter 12) [please refer to the [revised Chapter 12](#) on Flora & Fauna] justifies the restoration design that seeks to retain as much of the existing tree cover as possible*". It also confirms that the proposed scheme has been designed such as "*to enhance conditions for the regionally important local population of Soprano Pipistrelle bats and for a range of farmland bird species that have suffered national decline*".
- 3.52 Furthermore, the applicant company maintains that wildlife corridors would be formed as part of the restoration of the site, linking it to the surrounding areas, and habitats, which would serve to "*improve species migration*".
- 3.53 From a landscape perspective, it is important to note that the phased restoration includes planting to "*maintain key green corridors within and around the site throughout the operational period, together with new wetlands to enhance the ecological value of the river corridor*".
- 3.54 Finally, the [revised Project Description](#) confirms the applicant company's position that the proposed scheme "*would improve public access by including potential public access corridors and new public access points around the site*" and states that the overall aim would be to provide a "*riverside public access*".

*bridleway corridor*”, which the applicant company claims would “*contribute to the potential for a link between Catterick and Kirkby Fleetham*”.

- 3.55 The earlier mentioned revised restoration scheme includes hedgerows and field margins/conservation headlands and an area of species rich grassland around the ‘*east lake*’ (Lake 2).

‘Aftercare’ and long-term management of the site

- 3.56 In terms of the proposed aftercare of the restored site, the proposals comprise of the maintenance of each phase of the application site over a period of 5 years “*to ensure the successful establishment of pasture and tree planting*”. The applicant company sets out the aims of the aftercare scheme, which include the management and maintenance of both natural (e.g. wetland areas) and man-made (e.g. post and wire fencing) features within the site.
- 3.57 The applicant company states that the [statutory five-year aftercare period](#) would apply to the restored site. As discussed above, the proposed restoration of the site is progressive and so the aftercare would also be phased, starting as phases within the site have been restored. The applicant company also states that due to this progressive aftercare approach, “*much of the site would receive more than 5 years aftercare*”. In total, the applicant company is proposing 25 years of progressive restoration and aftercare.
- 3.58 The applicant company explains within the [revised Project Description](#) of the ES (submission made in February 2016) that “*detailed management proposals would be prepared in liaison with all interested parties*” and agreed with the County Planning Authority. The applicant company states that the management proposals would provide a strategic framework for the restoration and management of the entire site and that the intention is to “*establish objectives and set out the policies and maintenance principles to achieve those objectives, for all the landscape elements proposed in the restoration*”.
- 3.59 In terms of the long-term management of the site, the applicant company has submitted a revised drawing, ‘[Proposed Area of Long Term Management](#)’ (drwg no. NT10306/14/004 rev B, dated February 2016), which the applicant company intends to form part of the [proposed S106 Legal Agreement](#) (explained in more detail below) by which it would be bound. The drawing shows that both Lake 2 (‘*east lake*’) and Lake 3 (‘*south lake*’) are earmarked for long-term bird management measures.
- 3.60 The [draft S106 Legal Agreement](#) also comprises a *Bird Management Plan* (BMP), lake and lake margins management for two of the three proposed lakes within the restored site and species-rich grassland (in respect of which is proposed an undertaking to manage such for a period of twenty years) as

well as native woodland blocks for the second proposed lake ('east lake') situated within 'Killerby East'.

#### Information prior to the submission of the planning application

- 3.61 The submission of this planning application was preceded by a formal request made on behalf of the applicant company for a Scoping Opinion from the County Planning Authority (though received on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009, validated on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2009). A [Scoping Opinion](#) provides a formal declaration of the matters such as air quality, hydrology, noise, traffic etc. (depending upon the nature, scale and/or location of the proposed development) that, in the opinion of the determining planning authority, are considered should be assessed in terms of their likely significant environmental impacts and the information provided within any Environmental Statement that may accompany any subsequent planning application. The [formal Scoping Opinion](#) was duly adopted on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2010. A copy of that Scoping Opinion is also available to view on the County Council's Online Planning Register using the application ref. no. NY/2009/0320/SCO.

#### Information accompanying the planning application

- 3.62 In addition to the requisite [application form](#) and [annex](#), [ownership](#) and [agricultural holdings](#) certificates and [formal notices](#) submitted in July 2010, the following documents accompanied the application:
- a [Non-Technical Summary](#) of the Environmental Statement (NTS) (July 2010) (now superseded by a revised submission in May 2015); and,
  - a formal *Environmental Statement* (ES) (accompanied by figures, tables, diagrams, photographs and appendices) (July 2010).
- 3.63 The environmental matters subject to environmental impact assessment and consequently covered within the submitted Environmental Statement (ES) include landscape and visual impact, cultural heritage, soils and agriculture, the water environment (hydrology/hydrogeology), air quality, noise, ecology (flora and fauna), transport, and access and recreation.
- 3.64 The application has been supported and informed by geological information in the form of [borehole logs](#) and *mineral evaluation logs*, an [Arboricultural Impact Report](#) (dated August 2009), an [Historic Environment Assessment](#) (accompanied by a [Scheme of Archaeological Evaluation and Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (dated June 2009), the [results of field walking](#), a [Geophysical Survey](#), the outcomes of a programme of [Evaluation Trenching](#), and a [Geo-archaeological Analysis](#) (the results of evaluation of landform settings and potential archaeological associations), a [Soil Survey](#) (as well as [heavy metal testing](#)), a [Flood Risk Assessment](#) and a [Modelling Study of the River Swale](#), monitoring of groundwater levels and calculations, a [Noise Survey](#), an [Ecological Assessment](#) (as well as habitat surveys and a [Bat Report](#), [Reptile](#)

[Method Statement](#) and [Bird Management Strategy](#)) and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

- 3.65 The application drawings that were submitted in 2010 comprised:
- *Site Location* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 1, dated July 2010);
  - *Application Boundary* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 2, dated July 2010);
  - *Topographic Survey* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3, dated July 2010);
  - *Cross Sections* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 4, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan Composite* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 5, dated July 2010);
  - *Advance Works* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 6, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan-Phase 1* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 7, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan-Phase 2* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 8, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan-Phase 3* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 9, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan-Phase 4* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 10, dated July 2010);
  - *Phasing Plan-Phase 5* (drwg no. NT10306/12/figure 11 dated July 2010);
  - *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. NT 10306/12/figure 12 dated July 2010).
- 3.66 During the processing of the application, in part, as a consequence of the receipt of responses to consultation on the proposals and also, partly, as a result of revised proposals for the site access and assessment of the impacts of the proposed development in light of the highway improvement works for the A1(T), further information, during the course of processing the application has been received in relation to certain environmental topic areas (outlined below). These have been made available to view on the County Council's Online Planning Register, have been subject to consultation with those with whom the County Planning Authority had originally consulted in 2010 and have also been subject to public consultation through the means of formal notices in October 2014.
- 3.67 These environmental topic areas subject to updated information and consequent revision comprise:
- Transport, Traffic and Accessibility*
- [Transport Statement](#)<sup>9</sup> (May 2014) prepared by WA Fairhurst on behalf of the applicant company;
  - [supporting letter](#) from applicant's agent (Wardell Armstrong) (June 2014);
  - [correspondence](#) between Officers of the County Planning Authority and the Highway Authority (September 2014);
  - Highway Authority [re-consultation response](#) (7<sup>th</sup> October 2014); and,
  - Highway Authority [revised recommendation](#) and [accompanying suggested planning conditions](#) (6<sup>th</sup> October 2014).

---

<sup>9</sup> The Transport Statement was prepared by the applicant to review revised proposals for the site access and assess the impact of the development in light of the Highways Agency's plans for the A1(T) and should be read alongside the Transport Chapter of the original ES (July 2010) and does not therefore replace the Transport Chapter of the original ES (July 2010).

*Nature Conservation and Habitat Protection*

- [letter](#) from applicant's agent (Wardell Armstrong) (July 2014);
- updated [Ecological Appraisal](#) (including a revised *Bird Management Plan* (BMP)<sup>10</sup> (July 2014); and,
- ['Proposed Area and Long Term Management Plan'](#) (July 2014).

*Cultural Heritage and Archaeology*

- [correspondence](#) from agent (October 2014); and,
- submission of an ['Archaeological Evaluation of Peat Deposit, Killerby Prospect, North Yorkshire'](#) (October 2012).

*Restoration, Aftercare and Soil Management*

- [correspondence](#) from agent (October 2014); and,
- ['Restoration Masterplan'](#) (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.8 rev D, dated March 2015).

- 3.68 In December 2014, draft Heads of Terms within a proposed Section 106 Legal Agreement (under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended) accompanied by a plan showing the ['Proposed Area for Long Term Management'](#) (drwg no. NT10306/14/003 dated July 2014) was submitted by the applicant company.
- 3.69 The [draft S106 Legal Agreement](#) includes the proposed areas of the application site which would form part of the long-term management of the site and the owner's covenants with the County Planning Authority surrounding the *Bird Management Plan*.
- 3.70 As a result of discussions between the applicant company and the County Planning Authority in 2015, further information in the form of revisions to sections of the Environmental Statement and accompanying plans were submitted, which were undertaken by the applicant company's agent to "*reflect the changes brought about by the implementation of the A1(T) upgrade to motorway standard*". The agent has confirmed in a letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015 that the amendments are a result of "*confirmation of the route of the Local Access Road which will now follow the alignment of the existing southbound carriageway adjacent to the site*". The agent has also clarified in the correspondence that this confirmation of the route of the Local Access Road (LAR) removes the need for the use of the land identified within sub-Phase 1B for an access road and has therefore been omitted from the description of development. However, the area outlined as sub-Phase 1B remains within the red line boundary of the application site.
- 3.71 The agent has also confirmed that the application has been amended in that there has been a revision to the position of the advanced screen planting

---

<sup>10</sup> It is important to clarify that some consultation responses, as set out in Section 4.0 of this Committee Report refer to a *Bird Plan Strategy* (BMS), which for the purpose of this report is the same as a *Bird Management Plan* (BMP).



adjacent to Lagoon 1 in sub-Phase 1A, which was a result of discussions with the relevant landowner.

- 3.72 The revised information, including drawings, comprised:
- [letter from agent to the County Planning Authority](#) (March 2015);
  - [revised ES Chapter 2 - Site Description](#) (March 2015);
  - [revised ES Chapter 3 – Project Description](#) (March 2015); and
  - [revised Non-Technical Summary](#) (March 2015).

*Revised Application Drawings*

- [Application Boundary](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig 2A, dated March 2015);
  - [Topographic Survey](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig3A dated March 2015);
  - [Cross Sections](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig4A dated March 2015);
  - [Phasing Plan-Composite](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig5A dated March 2015)
  - [Advance Works](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig6A dated March 2015)
  - [Phasing Plan-Phase 1](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig7A dated March 2015);
  - [Phasing Plan-Phase 2](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig8A dated March 2015);
  - [Phasing Plan-Phase 3](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig9A dated March 2015);
  - [Phasing Plan-Phase 4](#) (drwg no.NT10306/12/fig10A dated March 2015);
  - [Phasing Plan-Phase 5](#) (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig11A dated March 2015; and,
  - [Restoration Masterplan](#) (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig12D dated March 2015)
- 3.73 Corresponding revisions were made in respect of the above plans contained within the Environmental Statement with the addition of:
- Figure 2.3 *Topographical Survey* (drwg no. NT10306/12/Fig2.3 RevA dated March 2015; and,
  - Figure 2.4 *Arboricultural Assessment* (drwg no. NT10306/12/Fig2.4 RevA dated March 2015).

- 3.74 As discussed above, due to the amendments made within certain sections of the ES and associated drawings and plans, a revised Non-Technical Summary was also prepared (March 2015) and submitted to the County Planning Authority.

- 3.75 In correspondence dated 26<sup>th</sup> February 2016, the Agent confirmed further amendments had been made to the '*Restoration Masterplan*' to reflect feedback from the County Planning Authority's adviser on matters relating to ecology, which sought more areas of long-term management. The agent confirmed that the revised approach included long-term management of field headlands and hedgerows. The revised restoration scheme also shows an area of species-rich grassland around Lake 2 ('*east lake*'), instead of agricultural land, as previously proposed by the applicant company. These changes were reflected upon a further revised drawing, the '*Restoration Masterplan*' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.8 Rev F, dated February 2016).

- 3.76 The '*Project Description*' section of the Environmental Statement was also further revised (submission made in February 2016) to reflect these amended restoration details.
- 3.77 In terms of the long-term management of the restored application site, a revised drawing, '[Proposed Area of Long Term Management](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/14/004 rev B, dated February 2016) was also submitted alongside this additional information showing further restoration details. The agent advised that this drawing would accompany a proposed legal agreement prepared under the provisions of [Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 \(as amended\)](#) and would comprise:
- a '*Bird Management Plan*';
  - lake and lake margins management for Lake 2 ('*east lake*') and Lake 3 ('*south lake*') i.e two of the three proposed lakes within the restored site;
  - species-rich grassland and native woodland blocks for Lake 2 ('*east lake*'); and
  - conservation headlands and hedges.
- 3.78 A further submission with specific regard to the proposals on restoration have meant that the most recent and, therefore, most up-to-date plan is the '[Restoration Masterplan](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016).
- 3.79 In order to ensure that the application is supported by up-to-date information, an [updated Ecological Baseline Update Survey](#) (dated October 2016) has been submitted to the County Planning Authority.
- 3.80 Again, as a result of further discussions with stakeholders, the '[Proposed Area of Long Term Management](#)' has been revised and is now referenced as revision C (drwg no. NT10306/14/004 rev C, dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2016).
- 3.81 The most recent information submitted to the County Planning Authority is that which supports the preparation of the draft S106 Legal Agreement, namely, a [Preliminary Bat Mitigation Strategy](#) (dated January 2017).
- 3.82 Again, as a result of further discussions during the processing of the application, as a consequence of the receipt of responses to consultation on the proposals, further information was received and again this information has been made available to view on the County Council's Online Planning Register, has been subject to consultation with those with whom the County Planning Authority had originally consulted in 2010 and 2014 and has also been subject to public consultation through the means of formal notices most recently in December 2016.
- 3.83 While the Environmental Statement has been updated, in parts, and consequently addendums produced where relevant, it is nevertheless

considered that a comprehensive set of environmental information available accompanying the application exists upon which the County Planning Authority has consulted.

Draft S106 Legal Agreement

- 3.84 As referred earlier, the planning application is accompanied by a [draft Legal Agreement](#) under [Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 \(as amended\)](#) which has undergone a number of iterations during the processing of this application. The latest draft of the Agreement is dated 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and that draft along with its predecessors have been made available to view on the County Planning Authority's [Online Planning Register](#) either upon receipt or shortly thereafter.
- 3.85 The [S106 Legal Agreement](#) is made (subject to signing by the relevant parties, final completion and engrossments) between the County Planning Authority, the landowner (in this case Mrs Pybus of Street House Farm, Leeming Bar, North Yorkshire, the relevant mortgagees and the applicant company, Tarmac) requiring
- the submission of a *Bird Management Plan* (which provides for the management of flocking birds, grasslands, monitoring and use of deterrents) for the approval of the County Planning Authority;
  - the management and maintenance of *conservation headlands* and species-rich grasslands for a period of twenty years after the end of the final year of the last of the statutory five-year 'after-care' periods in accord with the '*Strategic Management Framework*' (relating to the areas referred to as '*Killerby East*' and '*Killerby South*' as areas of long-term management comprising species-rich grasslands, scrapes and alder carr woodland and conservation headlands) also to be submitted to (and approved by) the County Planning Authority;
  - agreed traffic routeing;
  - the making of contribution payments to the County Council in respect of the maintenance of relevant Public Rights of Way (including bridleways and gateways) equivalent to a period of fifty years amounting to £69,957.50; and,
  - bat monitoring for a period of twenty years after the end of the final year of the last of the statutory five-year 'after-care' periods.

Draft planning conditions

- 3.86 National planning guidance encourages early dialogue on the matter of draft planning conditions that may or may not be acceptable to the County Planning Authority were planning permission to be forthcoming. To this end, a [draft schedule of planning conditions](#) has been exchanged with the applicant company and these have also been made available to view together with the [written agreement of the applicant company](#) to the imposition of any pre-commencement conditions should they be reasonably imposed.

## 4.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The application was received on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2010, validated and registered as a duly-made application on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010. For the reason explained earlier in this report, the determination of this particular application was prohibited by Direction held in place by the Secretary of State for Transport until the end of 2014. In the intervening period between that time and the present, further information relating to the application, having been both sought and volunteered by the applicant in light of changes in circumstance, has necessitated both advertisement of that information and a period of publicity and consultation. A review of the submitted information at the time of preparing the report recommending that Members undertake a formal Committee Site Visit suggested information had been submitted upon which there had been neither consultation nor publicity. In order to ensure procedural correctness, a final round of consultation and publicity has been undertaken during December 2016. As anticipated within the last Officer report presented to Members, the period of publicity and consultation has concluded at the time of writing this substantive report and the outcome of that consultation now herein provided.
- 4.2 For the purpose of this report, a summary of the responses to consultation undertaken on behalf of the County Planning Authority is provided. The County Planning Authority has sought the views of statutory consultees and other non-statutory consultees on three occasions during the processing of this application. The first round of consultation commenced on the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010 (*‘the 2010 consultation’*) immediately following the submission of the planning application and then, subsequently, on two further occasions on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2014 (*‘the 2014 consultation’*) and the third and final round on 21<sup>st</sup> December 2016 (*‘the 2016 consultation’*).
- 4.3 The purpose of *the 2014 consultation* was to seek views in respect of:
- additional/further information received between May and October 2014 comprising:
    - further archaeological investigation, specifically an *‘Archaeological Evaluation of Peat Deposit, Killerby Prospect, North Yorkshire’* (October 2012);
    - a *Transport Statement* (May 2014);
    - revised Transport Chapter of the Environmental Statement;
    - revised *‘Ecological Baseline Update Survey’* and *‘Bird Management Strategy’* (BMS) (July 2014);
    - *‘Proposed Area of long-term Management Plan’* (July 2014); and,
    - revised *‘Restoration Masterplan’ (Rev C, April 2013)*.
- 4.4 The purpose of *the 2016 consultation* was to seek views in respect of:
- letter (dated 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015) including revised ES Non-Technical Summary (received May 2015), revised ES Ch.2 (Mar 2015), revised

application drawings (Figs.2A-11A) & revised ES drawings Figs.2.1A, 2.3A, 2.4A, 3.1A-3.6A & 3.9A;

- letter (dated 26<sup>th</sup> February 2016) including revised ES Ch.3 (Feb 2015) & *Proposed Area of Long Term Management Plan* (dwrg no. NT10306/14/004) (Sept 2014);
- letter (dated 20<sup>th</sup> October 2016) including information from Hafren Water Ltd (17<sup>th</sup> October 2016), an *Ecological Baseline Update Survey* (October 2016), *Post Application Cross Section of Phase 2* (dwrg no. K034/00198) (10<sup>th</sup> August 2016) and conveyance (31<sup>st</sup> May 1960);
- letter (21<sup>st</sup> November 2016) & annexes plus revised ES Ch.12 (April 2013) & Ch.7 (November 2014), revised *Archaeological Scheme of Works* (November 2014), revised *Restoration Masterplan* (dwrg no. K034-210 Rev.H) (1<sup>st</sup> July 2016), *Statement on Geological Investigation* (10<sup>th</sup> November 2016) and revised draft S106 Legal Agreement and accompanying documents; and,
- e-mail (24<sup>th</sup> November 2016) including revised Annex 1 & enclosing revised *Phasing Plan - Phase 5* (4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).

4.5 While a summary of consultation responses received is provided herein, nonetheless, all responses to consultation received by the County Planning Authority have been displayed in their entirety (with the exception of personal information removed for the purpose of data protection) on the County Council's Online Planning Register either on the date of their receipt or shortly thereafter. Interested parties, including the agent and applicant, have, thereby, had readily available access to their content and, as a consequence, have been afforded the opportunity to react or respond, as appropriate, to their content at the earliest possible point in time in the processing of this application.

4.6 **Historic England** (the successor body of English Heritage) – in their [response dated 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2010](#) confirmed that they had no comments to make towards the proposed development and recommended that the application “*should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance*” and on the basis of specialist conservation advice. This was subsequently reiterated within the response to both *the 2014 consultation*, on [4<sup>th</sup> November 2014](#), and *the 2016 consultation* on [23<sup>rd</sup> December 2016](#).

4.7 **Highways England** (the successor body of the Highways Agency) - in their response dated [29<sup>th</sup> October 2010](#) confirmed that they had applied for a “*holding notice in the form of a TR110*”. The response noted that the application references the “*second stage upgrade of the A1 from Leeming to Barton*”. However, they confirmed at that time that the proposed upgrade was no longer going ahead, requested the application be “*resubmitted showing detailed proposals for Low Street junction*” removing “*all references to the Leeming to Barton upgrade*” and also requested that the applicant company

submit a Transport Statement and a revised transport chapter within the ES on the *“basis that the A1 Leeming to Barton upgrade will no longer go ahead”*.

In a second response, dated [21<sup>st</sup> February 2011](#), the County Planning Authority was informed of the findings of work undertaken by third party consultants that had been commissioned to inform of the acceptability of the proposed closure of the existing Low Street junction and the compliance of the new junction with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards. It confirmed that as a result of the A1 Leeming to Barton Improvement Scheme being cancelled, following the spending review, an *“upgrade to the Low Street junction will be required in order to accommodate the quarry HGV traffic”*. It went on to explain that the applicant company’s transport consultant proposes a left in, left out priority junction, situated circa 100 metres north of the existing Low Street junction and that it was considered appropriate to provide a priority junction at the site. It provided advice in relation to visibility splays from the proposed new junction, stating that these should be in accordance with DMRB standards and made reference to an existing parking lay-by situated circa 250 metres north of the existing Low Street junction. Consideration was also sought in respect of the lay-by due to the fact it falls within the visibility splay and would therefore obstruct visibility. The applicant company’s transport consultant should, at that time during the processing of the application, *“give consideration to how this will be managed or relocated in order to prevent an obstruction to visibility at the proposed junction”* and take into account signage also situated within the required visibility splay of the new junction. The response also noted that the new junction should have taken into consideration the existing hedgerows which, abut the A1 carriageway.

The applicant company’s transport consultant was required to confirm that the design conformed to *“Table 7/2 of the TD42/95 and provide tracking to show manoeuvres can be achieved and vehicles will be able to pass a stationary or broken down vehicle within the junction”*. The response also noted that the associated merge taper design should have been *“reconsidered in order to meet DMRB standards and a tracking diagram provided in order to ensure manoeuvres can be undertaken safely and to confirm that the merge provision is sufficient and negates the need to apply corner radii standards”*. The response made reference to DMRB TD 42/95 section 7.18, which stated that *“where large goods vehicles comprise a significant proportion of the turning movements, use of the compound curve shown in Figure 7/3 is recommended”* and seeking this to be reflected on revised plans.

In terms of the capacity of the proposed junction, the response noted that the *“traffic flows have not been verified and the growth factors used are not correct”* and that it was evident that the traffic flows *“could increase significantly and the junction would continue to operate within capacity”*.

The response required additional information comprising:

- *Traffic count data;*
- *an updated design to ensure the merge taper meets DMRB standards;*
- *updated plans showing the existing parking lay-by and its interaction with the proposed junction;*
- *visibility splays on the figures provided;*
- *consideration of the removal or relocation of signage within the visibility splays; and*
- *tracking to show HGV manoeuvres can be achieved within this junction design and use of the compound curve calculation due to the likely high proportion of HGV traffic”.*

Finally, the response reiterated the requirement for a Road Safety Audit and that an order would be needed to be in place with the Highway Authority to allow for the closure of the existing road, prior to agreeing a new layout and access.

Later in a meeting, on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2013, it was confirmed that *“the mainline design (A1(M)) has been approved and the side road/ local access road (LAR) are still at the design stage”* and that as part of the LAR works package, there would be a new junction with Low Street. The potential of also progressing the application with the left turn only option as stated in the ES (July 2010) was also discussed and it was confirmed that there was *“nothing in theory, to stop this approach”* with the potential of *“progressing with a preferred option at this stage and then an amendment to the permission submitted at a later date if changes are required”*.

It was confirmed that a Road Safety Audit (RSA) would be required of the new junction *“with the design conditioned to the planning permission but again stressed that this may be abortive work”* for the applicant (the Highway Authority also confirmed that a Stage 1 RSA would also be required for access junction directly from the application site onto Low Street).

Furthermore, it was confirmed that a Section 278 (S278) Agreement (under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980) would also be required for the proposed road works if the applicant decided not to wait for the proposed A1(M) upgrade. However, the applicant confirmed that they *“would be happy to wait until October/ November to await the outcome of the LAR design approval”* as the applicant would prefer that the Agency undertook the improvements to the junction at Low Street and the A1(M).

In response to *the 2014 consultation* and *the 2016 consultation*, it was confirmed ([November 2014](#)) that there was no longer any objection held against the proposed development and this was again reiterated on [19<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#).

- 4.8 **Natural England** – in their [response dated 4<sup>th</sup> November 2010](#), set out their statutory purpose to be to “*ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development*” as well as setting out their approach and views in relation to the following topics: landscape; ecology; soil management; restoration and aftercare; access and recreation; hydrology; and agreements and schemes.

*Landscape* – considered the *Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)* to have been undertaken in accordance with the appropriate guidance published by *the Landscape Institute, the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment* and *the Countryside Agency*, expressed satisfaction with the assessment undertaken of the potential landscape and visual impacts as presented in the ES (July 2010) and recognised that, despite the topography of the area being predominately flat and well-screened by the existing plantation woodland, “*the nature of the proposal means that screening of a low height should be sufficient in effectively limiting views of quarrying activities during the operation of the site*”. From a landscape perspective the proposed restoration was considered to be appropriate as it proposes features which exist already in the area, such as water bodies, woodland and hedgerows and is “*in keeping with the landscape character of the surrounding area*”. The response also supported the progressive nature of the proposed restoration considering that it would be “*effective in minimising the impact of the proposed development on the landscape and on visual receptors in the surrounding area*” and welcomed the planned return of much of the site to agricultural land.

*Ecology* - the response welcomed the guidance used by the applicant company as the most up-to-date and relevant, expressed satisfaction with the range of ecological survey work that had been carried out as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and also the methodologies used during the information gathering process, but advised that the County Planning Authority should be satisfied with the scope of habitats set out within the Phase 1 Habitat Survey. The applicant company was advised that any “*protected species licence application will need to be accompanied by a survey conducted within the previous two years and a detailed mitigation strategy*”. The proposal to undertake additional ecological surveys each phase of the development “*particularly in those phases where potential protected species issues have been identified in the submitted surveys*” was welcomed, but further advised that if restoration were to result in valuable areas of new habitat, then there exists the potential for this to attract larger numbers of protected species and therefore greater levels of mitigation could be required. The proposed restoration has the potential to create an area of diverse habitats that could underpin existing species in the area; acknowledging that the restoration has been informed by the Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) of both the local Councils and the applicant company, whilst at the same time



requiring the incorporation of flexibility to enable “*habitat creation and restoration to be able to respond to unforeseen opportunities*”. Furthermore, the proposed mitigation was considered to be appropriate and, subject to it being carried out, it should “*ensure that the value of the restored site for biodiversity is both maintained and enhanced*”. Finally, in respect of ecology, the response questioned how much of the proposed mitigation for the loss of 1,435 metres of hedgerow would be achieved via retention and how much via the creation of new hedgerow; confirming a stance against any net loss of habitat.

*Soil management* - the excavation, storage and movement of soils on site should be carried out in accordance with guidance from the Department of Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) ‘*Good Practice Guidelines-guidelines for handling soil*’ (MAFF,2000) and the *draft Code of Practice (Draft Code of Practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites, 2008)* to ensure that damage to soil structure is minimised and expressed satisfaction that the proposed soil management for the site “*will ensure that the physical characteristics of the soils within the proposal site will be retained*”; welcoming the creation and objectives of a *Soil Management Plan*, as mentioned in the ES (July 2010).

*Restoration and after-care* - the proposed progressive restoration of the worked quarry received support and in terms of after-care advised that the control of invasive plant species should be specifically referenced within the aims of the *After-care Scheme*.

*Access & recreation* – supported the creation of 8.8 kilometres of new bridleway and the proposed mitigation measures that aim to “*limit the impact of this proposal on public rights of way and on recreational users of these routes*”.

*Hydrology* – with regards the Swales Lakes SSSI expressed satisfaction that any potential impact upon this wetland habitat has been adequately addressed by the applicant company.

*Agreements & Schemes* - the application site falls within land included within Environmental Stewardship agreements with Natural England and any agreement holder would need to liaise with Natural England on how the “*loss of this land to development might affect the agreements and payments received*”.

In their response dated [24<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#), it was confirmed that the advice provided in their response to the first round of consultation was equally applicable to the application as amended and returned no objection to the proposed development.

No further comments above those previously made were offered on [6<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#) in response to *the 2016 consultation*.

- 4.9 **Ministry of Defence** - in its response dated [8<sup>th</sup> November 2010](#), confirmed no objection to the proposed development, on the premise that the [Bird Management Plan](#) (BMP) be amended to ensure that MoD requirements were appropriately considered and noting that the BMP needed to include “*active bird control measures should the aerodrome operator identify a birdstrike hazard*” and that “*the passive control measures have not accounted for MOD's earlier comments, particularly relating to marginal reedbed planting*” and, therefore, as a consequent put forward suggested changes to the BMP, relating to after-care, planting, additional bird species to be considered, active management, a call off bird monitoring and management plan and that the BMP should be controlled through a S106 legal agreement.
- 4.10 **Highway Authority** – in its response dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2010, requested additional information from the applicant company about the application site. The response expressed concern that the traffic generated from the development had the potential to affect sections of the local highway network, advising that the potential effects need to be assessed by the applicant company. The response also flagged the omissions of junctions including Brompton on Swale and Scorton. It also sought clarification and additional information as to where vehicles to the site would make their deliveries and advised that the design of the highways improvements to Low Street required further discussion surrounding improvements to the junction. Later, on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2011, the Highway Authority stated it shared the Highways Agency's comments, confirmed “*the old road will need to be stopped up*” and that they expected to see a more detailed design and some indication on how the relevant road Orders would be progressed.

Later in a revised response, dated [2<sup>nd</sup> February 2012](#), the Highway Authority set out a number of conditions that it recommend to be attached to any subsequent planning permission for the proposed development. These related to access to and from the site; vehicular movement on site; enabling highways works; required safety audit; mud disturbance from quarry vehicles; preparation of stopping up orders in relation to enabling highways works; and the preparation of a Travel Plan.

In a further response, on [7<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#), the Highway Authority provided suggested wording for a ‘*Grampian*’ condition:

*“No sand and gravel shall be removed from the site area shown on drawing NT10306/12/figure 3 by road until the local access road (LAR) is constructed connecting to Low street allowing access to the A1 up grade as shown on Highway Agency plans dated 3rd April 2013 is completed and open to the public”.*

That response also included a recommendation that a S106 legal agreement be put in place to control the operation of HGVs comprising a *Traffic Management Plan* to restrict HGV vehicle operation and movements to the site via the LAR and the improved Low Street to the application site. While no objections were raised against the proposed development, specific conditions proposed the control over the:

- HGV movements until the LAR is constructed;
- movement of vehicles to and from the site, whereby vehicles must use the existing access with the public highway at Low Street;
- movement of vehicles until appropriate measures are in place to prevent the discharge of surface water from affecting the highway;
- movement of vehicles until an element of the permanent site access has been fully constructed;
- movement of vehicles between the highway and the application site until visibility splays have been created;
- approval of details for works in the highway;
- works within the application site until details have been approved regarding the proposed alignment and strengthening of parts of Low Street from the site access to the LAR;
- works on site until details of access, turning and parking are agreed;
- movement of vehicles to and from site until details regarding proposed precautions to prevent mud reaching the highway have been agreed;
- on-site parking, on-site storage and construction traffic during development;
- routing of HGV construction traffic; and
- agreement of a *Travel Plan*.

On [6<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#), there were no further comments returned from the Highway Authority in respect of the 2016 consultation.

- 4.11 **Swale and Ure Drainage Board** (formerly the Bedale and Upper Ure Internal Drainage Board) in a [response dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2010](#), referred to comments previously made on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2010, confirming them to equally apply to this proposed application. The IDB stated it would “*exercise general supervision over all matters relating to the drainage of land within their district; and have such other powers and perform such other duties as are conferred or imposed by the Land Drainage Act 1991*” and confirmed the “*Board operates Land Drainage Byelaws under s66 and is empowered to grant consents under s23 and enforce under s24*” reiterating it has “*no powers relating to the River Swale and associated flood embankments which are Main Rivers under the jurisdiction of the EA*”. The response did, however, identify Fiddale Beck as being under the control of the IDB via a byelaw and that consent would be required for any structures affecting the watercourses under the control of the IDB. A number of byelaws were stated as relating to various controls over hydrological features, including: controls of introduction of water into the drainage district by consent; controls on diversion or stopping up of adopted watercourses by consent; controls on detrimental substances in

watercourses; controls by consent on any obstructions within the Byelaw Strip which extends 9 metres inland either side from the banks of adopted watercourses; controls over the storage of materials on the river banks; controls over the removal of sand and gravel from the bed of the watercourse; controls over fences excavations pipes etc. in or over any watercourse or bank by consent. Consent would also be required for any structures affecting any relevant watercourses and the Land Drainage Act (1994) gives the Board permissive powers to carry out its functions. Finally, it explained that is unlikely the Board will continue to maintain the watercourses within the site boundary until full restoration works have concluded. However, the Board “*will continue to enforce the LDA and Byelaws during execution of the works to ensure compliance*”.

A further response, dated [27<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#) considered that the proposed development would no longer affect North Lowfield Stell and South Lowfield Stell. However, the response noted that if this not the case then the earlier comments submitted would still stand.

On 13<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017, the Board raised concerns with regards river erosion (prompted by experience following the 2015 flood events) and the details are contained within the Board’s [written response](#) and further [written supplementary response](#).

In responding to the comments of the Board, the agent for the applicant on the [25<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#), explained that river erosion being a natural occurrence would occur whether or not quarrying was to take place. Notwithstanding, appropriate protection measures have been proposed including a 20 metre stand-off from the river channel and a reinforced bank design on the ‘*west lake*’ shoreline adjacent to the river. Oversized cobbles and clays from overburden and interburden are proposed to be placed against the lake edge; the position of which is to be a further 10 metres beyond the proposed 20-metre stand-off from the channel edge of the river.

In response, the Board stated “*given the 20m stand-off and (...) additional works which [the Board] assume will be conditioned [the Board] can now raise no further objection to the proposal*”.

- 4.12 **Yorkshire Water Services Limited** - in its response, dated [23<sup>rd</sup> November 2010](#), confirmed that the planning application does not consider a third water main that crosses the western boundary of the application site within the proposed Phase 1. The response also makes reference to the fact that the accompanying *Restoration Masterplan* shows a side road, hedgerows and trees to be located over the water main.

It confirmed that the water main “*can remain in place throughout the quarry operations if it is decided to be the most appropriate option*” and that the

legislation this is controlled through is Schedule 14 of the Water Industry Act (1991); thereby negating the need for a planning condition. However, it also confirmed that *“the phasing of development, subsequent extraction and restoration scheme should all take into account the presence of this water main as Yorkshire Water has the option to maintain the position of the infrastructure”* warning that that any damage to the main may result in a lack of water supply to parts of the county and, therefore the water main must be *“acknowledged and provisions made for its protection as it may not be diverted”*. The applicant company was therefore advised to discuss this further with Yorkshire Water Services Limited.

In a further response, on [7<sup>th</sup> November 2014](#), it was specified that there should be no excavation within 5 metres of the water main and that it should be *“protected from potential damage from machinery and excavations if it is to remain in its current position”*. It is therefore recommended that protection measures are discussed in advance of any works. The response also noted that it may be possible for the main to be diverted under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. However, such works will be carried out at a cost to the developer.

Having been consulted on further information in December 2016, Yorkshire Water noted that the applicant’s documentation acknowledges the presence of the water mains, indicated the pipes would remain in situ, that 10 metre wide strips would be maintained for the purposes of repair and maintenance and would be protected from accidental damage.

- 4.13 **Hambleton District Council (Environmental Health Officer)** – in its [response, dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010](#), confirmed that *“the details and proposals submitted by the applicant company are acceptable”* and that the application meets the guidelines set out in [Minerals Policy Statement 2: Controlling and mitigating the environmental effects of mineral extraction in England – Annex 2: Noise](#)<sup>11</sup>.

On [5<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#) in response to *the 2016 consultation*, there were no objections returned against the proposed development.

- 4.14 **NYCC adviser on ecological matters** - on [17<sup>th</sup> January 2011](#) set out a number of issues and recommendations in relation to the proposed development and the information accompanying the application. It was stated that the ecological assessment within the ES (July 2010) appears to have been carried out in accordance with the Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (IEEM) *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom* (2006) and noted that, in terms of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Minerals Policy Statement 2 was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) when it was published on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

proposed restoration of the site, the proposed restoration, as set out on the original *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig12, dated July 2010) did not include “*an appropriate level of biodiversity enhancement proposals to be acceptable when considering national planning policy guidance*”. As a result, a holding objection was lodged until further discussions are held surrounding potential opportunities to “*enhance appropriate biodiversity and increase flood plain connectivity whilst working within the character of the landscape*” including over the long-term management of the restored site.

- 4.15 It was recommended that ‘*biodiversity gains*’ should be increased and distributed more evenly throughout the application site and should include “*habitat connectivity between the water bodies, contoured woodland/ scrub planting and a much greater emphasis on biodiversity and floodplain connectivity in the western area*” of the site. It also noted that the original proposed restoration excluded any mention of “*separating peat, top soils & different compositions of subsoil & overburden to target specific habitat restoration, nor is there mention of management for biodiversity during the quarrying period, or of potential enhancement opportunities when considering built structures which are to remain*”. In light of this, the ES was considered to contain inadequate evidence to bring the proposed restoration of the site in line with national planning policy, as set out in *Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development* (January 2005) and *Planning Policy Statement 9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* (August 2005). The response also noted that the proposed restoration could also promote flood storage within the catchment and satisfy elements of *Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk* (March 2010)<sup>12</sup>.
- 4.16 In correspondence, dated [16<sup>th</sup> April 2014](#), it was stated that ecological surveys and assessments that had been submitted as part of the original ES (July 2010) were considered to be “*out-of-date for planning purposes*”. It was therefore advised that the ecological surveys and assessments should be carried out again by the applicant company and resubmitted. It was also advised that previously raised concerns surrounding the site restoration plan and the long-term management of the site needed to also be addressed by the applicant company.
- 4.17 As a consequence, [an agent letter](#) to the County Planning Authority, dated 4th August 2014, provided further information including: an updated ecological appraisal (July 2014); an updated *Bird Management Strategy* (June 2014); *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig3.8 rev C, dated April 2013); draft wording of a Grampian Condition relating to the construction of the LAR as part of the A1(M) upgrade works; and a plan of the application site, which

---

<sup>12</sup> Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (January 2005), Planning Policy Statement 9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (August 2005) and Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk (March 2010) were replaced by the NPPF when it was published on 27th March 2012.

the applicant company had suggested could be considered for long-term management purposes.

- 4.18 On 18<sup>th</sup> November 2014, the further response confirmed that the holding objection previously recommended was made on the basis that the level of biodiversity enhancement proposed by the applicant company was neither acceptable nor in accordance with national planning policy. Notwithstanding, the submission of additional environmental information, the adviser considered that it still did not address the previously raised concerns; noting *“an outstanding discrepancy between the level of biodiversity benefit being promoted within the ES and the actual benefits that can be delivered through the restoration and long term management proposed”*.
- 4.19 In relation to the ES (July 2010); the *Bird Management Strategy* (BMS) (2014) and the long-term management of the site, comments comprised:
- the proposed restoration included no pools or grassland but *“only large lakes and agricultural land”*. There was no mechanism proposed to secure, in the long-term, the promoted ecological restoration aims on land outside of the eastern lake area (as proposed via a S106);
  - there was no evidence that supported the applicant company’s claim that the proposed retention of trees around the proposed lake will provide *“an ornithological habitat of county ornithological importance”*;
  - the only area that was secured in the long-term was isolated from any surrounding habitats and was limited in its biodiversity benefit;
  - there was no information in the revised accompanying information that provides clarification on *“how the proposal “to breach the flood prevention bund at the end of operations so that the area would assist with flood alleviation” relates to the nature conservation end use in terms of the ability to deliver and manage the area”*;
  - habitat enhancements in the form of scrub planting that were proposed for the river corridor could be negatively affected from any planned breaching of flood prevention bunds;
  - there was a need to update the *Project Description* element of the ES to reflect the changes in the proposed BMP, which *“highlights that only very narrow fringing reeds will be included in the scheme rather than reedbeds”*;
  - in order to achieve biodiversity mitigation and enhancements that would be sustainable in the long-term, it was *“necessary to have a long-term management strategy that covers a larger area of the site than that which is proposed for the section 106”*;
  - the issue of potential nutrient run-off into the proposed lakes had not been adequately addressed;
  - reference to the cutting and burning of reedbeds within the ES following amendments to the BMP stated there would be no reedbeds; only narrow fringing reeds;
  - there was no indication as to how the marshland area around the west lake would be managed during the after-care period of the site; and

- there was reference to plans to include hedgerows within the long-term management agreement for the site.

4.20 Whilst satisfied with the additional survey work that has been undertaken, the response noted the following (in addition to previous comments on the original impact assessment and revised draft from April 2013 which still needed to be addressed):

- the amount of created/retained agricultural land related to bat foraging, needed to be updated to 132.1 hectares so as to match the amount quoted within Tables 12.11 and 12.12;
- the proposed restoration was inconsistent with the objective to deliver high quality habitats and the lack of long-term management across the site meant that there was no mechanism to secure long-term benefits;
- the information accompanying the application did not demonstrate how the *“UK BAP targets for arable field margins, hedgerows and mesotrophic lakes can be delivered and more importantly secured in the long term”*;
- required a framework setting out how the suggested mitigation and enhancement measures, e.g. the planting proposals along the river Swale corridor, would be dealt with and secured;
- more information was required on the proposed location of the bat house;
- clarification was required on how all of the proposed restoration lakes would be *“primarily created with wildlife, particularly birds, in mind”* and the statement within the ES that *“target bird species that the nature conservation (east) lake is being designed and managed for, to ensure that the restoration proposals are appropriate and that there is no conflict between the target bird species for a nature conservation lake (with an objective of being of County ornithological importance) and the measures required by the MOD contained within the BMS that is designed to deter target birds that are of concern to the aviation industry”*; and
- sought the inclusion of in-field trees as part of the restoration for the site that could be *“protected to provide mature trees for the future,”* which was considered important due to the *“biodiversity value of mature trees and the character of the local area”*;
- while satisfied that the BMP (2014) will also be satisfactory to the MoD, clarification was sought on how the *“east lake can meet its nature conservation objectives whilst implementing the measures necessary within the BMS for the MOD”*;
- clarification was also sought on the proposed method of maintaining the grass sward of the restored site to the desired levels of between 150mm and 200mm, which would be controlled in the areas outside of those covered by the S106;
- considered long-term management across the whole of the restored site, not just within the proposed area under the control of the proposed S106 was needed and that would need to consider how the *“multiple end uses”* could work cohesively.



Whilst not constituting an objection to the proposal, the response advised that the application should not be determined in the absence of the further information sought.

In response to being consulted upon further information in December 2016, [advice](#) was provided (dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017) recommending that further information be submitted including a *Bat Mitigation Strategy*, a *Strategic Management Framework* and an updated S106 legal agreement.

The agent, in a letter dated [27<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#), responding to the above submitted, a '[Preliminary Bat Mitigation Strategy](#)' (January 2017) prepared on behalf of the applicant by E<sup>3</sup> Ecology Ltd including further details for the provision of a *Bat Loft*. The '*Killerby West*' area lies outwith the birdstrike hazard zone and is therefore not covered by the proposed *Bird Strike Management Plan* within the draft S106 legal agreement. However, in respect of long-term management, the agent proposed a further clause within the draft S106 agreement to guarantee the submission of a *Strategic Management Framework* prior to commencement of mineral extraction.

A further response to consultation on the above-mentioned January 2017 submission, returned the following on [15<sup>th</sup> February 2017](#), having had sight of and having considered the further information:

- with regards the *Bat Mitigation Strategy*, stated this to be “*very much welcomed as it provides the detail needed...to determine the application*” and, therefore, expressed satisfaction; and,
- with regards the *Strategic Management Framework* is satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to enable its formulation.

Later on [16<sup>th</sup> February 2017](#), further advice highlighted that new guidance had recently been issued by DEFRA in which proposals such as that in this particular instance may consider favourably “*proposals which enable works to proceed without the exclusion of EPS [European Protected Species] [in this particular case of the Killerby proposals, bats] where the conservation status of the local population would not be detrimentally affected*”; however, concurrently advising that a management plan secured by legal agreement would be warranted.

- 4.21 **NYCC adviser on landscape matters** – noted, on [17<sup>th</sup> January 2011](#), that the recommendations for landscape-related work required, as set out within the *Scoping Report* (September 2009), did not appear to have been carried through in the proposed development, nor did the application include a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) of the area or provide “*an in-depth study of the character and historic layers and the evolution of the local landscape ie: both out-with and encompassing the application area] over the period of the evolution of the landscape, which would enable a more complete appreciation of sensitivity and the impacts on character*”. The response

recognised that there would be “*significant cumulative impact of mineral extraction on the local landscape*” and pointed out that the applicant company had not provided a strategic method to address this. It stated that the proposed development would result in impacts upon the landscape character of the area; visual impacts upon residential receptors, PRoW, and the local road network; and visual impacts upon the setting of the historic designed landscapes and on the River Swale corridor. The recommendations therein comprised requirements for:

- *a cohesive mitigation strategy, inclusive of off-site mitigation and local landscape enhancement.*
- *a cohesive landscape vision and strategy for the local landscape that encompasses cumulative impact issues and which forms a framework within which the Killerby restoration concept would sit.*
- *a clear landscape strategy and delivery mechanism for site and the context local landscape.*
- *a long term commitment to the delivery of a restoration vision and the long term management of the site and of the delivery of the Tarmac ‘mid-Swale valley landscape project’.*

A briefing paper for the preparation of a strategic landscape framework for the Mid-Swale Valley accompanied the response.

On [11<sup>th</sup> December 2014](#), a number of issues and recommendations included:

- strengthening of hedgerows and hedgerow trees in areas that are outside the extraction area could also be carried out;
- the proposed plant, in particular the conveyor, would introduce industrial infrastructure “*into a new and sensitive area, in relatively close proximity to Killerby Hall and its parkland*”;
- the restoration of the west area (sub-Phases 2A, 2B and 2C) appeared to be “*particularly unsympathetic to the landscape context*”;
- the proposed restoration should be updated to take into consideration the upgrade of the A1(M);
- the proposals for access to Killerby Hall and the new Broad Close Farm site were unclear and the proposed restoration scheme did not clarify which areas represent the restoration of Grade 2 agricultural land, or how the restored character will reflect the nature of the replaced soils;
- the landscape is “*more sensitive and complex*” than had been discussed within the LVIA and “*some further analysis and discussion is needed on the relationship of the proposals to the landscape and historic landscape character context taking into account*”;
- the *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig3.8 rev C, dated April 2014) did not clearly show restoration contours and how they tied into the surrounding landscape;
- queried and concerned about some aspects of the final landform;

- parkland was not illustrated on the *Restoration Masterplan* and the opportunity to enhance existing designed landscape character had been missed;
- the linking, or otherwise, of future water bodies to existing retained watercourses was unclear;
- the restoration plan fails to indicate those areas intended to be relatively stable and those that would be allowed to change in response to future changes in the course of the river, flooding and effects of climatic change;
- the accompanying information did not include a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) at an appropriate scale and the Hambleton LCA was overlooked in the ES (July 2010). Furthermore, the North Yorkshire and York LCA was available, and the effects of the proposed development in addition to “*existing forces for change*” that are discussed within the LCA, and the implications on restoration should be further explored;
- the cumulative impacts on the relevant landscape character had not been assessed within the ES;
- the reasons for the designation and subsequent omission of the former Special Landscape Area, which overlapped with the application site “*are not adequately explored*” within the ES;
- the archaeological study accompanying the ES had identified landform units on the basis of their geology, but these needed to be related to the local landscape character, and also to the proposed restoration scheme to show how the site “*integrates into the river corridor*”;
- the relationship of the ‘west lake’ to Oran House and to Killerby Hall needed further assessment;
- the contribution to landscape character of four country houses (comprising of Killerby Hall, Oran House, Kiplin Hall, and Kirkby Fleetham Hall) and their associated parkland and estates had not been adequately assessed;
- the revised restoration scheme had not been updated to take into account changes to the A1(M) proposals and “*the visibility of future quarry operations as seen by travellers along the A1(M) needs to be assessed*”;
- the assessment of certain viewpoints (VP5, VP7, VP10) were not considered to fully address the likely effects of the proposed development; and
- clarification was sought with regards from where the processing plant would be visible, taking into account the effectiveness of screening by trees during winter months.

A further [response](#) in relation to ‘*the 2016 consultation*’ was dated 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017. In that response, a number of further advices were received in addition to recommendations including:

- A – an opinion that the advice (please see above) provided in December 2014 remained to be addressed;
- B – a request for a co-ordinated *Landscape & Biodiversity Restoration and Management Framework*;
- C – an increased area of land covered by the S106 legal agreement; and,

D – a reduced ‘Killerby West’ area or its deletion.

Conditions with regard to the submission of a *Landscape and Biodiversity Restoration and Management Strategy/Framework*, advance planting, phased restoration details, soil conservation, processing plant and restoration after-care were suggested by the adviser.

In response to the comments made by the adviser on landscape matters, the agent on behalf of the applicant company (in a [letter](#) dated 6<sup>th</sup> February 2017) stated that the matters had, in their view, been addressed in their response of March 2014 and consider the information provided to support the application to be of sufficient detail to be able to determine the acceptability of the proposals. It goes further to suggest that views of the development from which it had been suggested may be obtained would either be unobtainable or sufficiently obscured by existing features lying within the landscape and local topography and welcomed the landscape adviser’s comment that “*on the whole, quarrying operations are unlikely to be obtrusive in the wider landscape*”. With regard to landscape enhancement, the agent refers to this as including 25 hectares of managed woodland and carr, 16.5 hectares of species-rich grassland, 8,000 metres of headland margins (10 metres wide) and 4,280 metres of hedges with trees supporting their view that significant enhancement would be brought. In addition, with regard to the non-designated park and garden or listed building, the assessment concluded no direct effects. Other matters upon which the agent has commented in response to the landscape adviser’s returned advice are available to view using the Online Planning Register by clicking [here](#) or referring to the document list and selecting document: ‘[170206\\_NY20100356ENV\\_Ltr from Agent to NYCC](#)’ within the register. However, in response to recommendations A to D within the landscape adviser’s consultation response, the agent’s response is summarised as:

- A - consider the information provided to support the application to be of sufficient detail to be able to determine the acceptability of the proposals;
- B – such a framework forms part of the proposals;
- C – “*there is sufficient land in the area proposed to be managed in the long term to more than offset any adverse landscape effects of the development*” and, furthermore, cannot be included within the draft S106 legal agreement as the land lies outwith the control of the applicant company; and,
- D – the removal of ‘Killerby West’ is considered by the applicant company to be unreasonable, without justification and, furthermore, its inclusion will ensure the site’s ability to contribute to mineral supply in the context of the Local Plan.

Having had sight of the aforementioned agent letter of [6<sup>th</sup> February 2017](#), the County Council’s own in-house adviser on landscape matters further commented maintaining earlier expressed concerns with regard to the extent

of quarrying in the area referred to as 'Killerby West', an apparent, in their opinion, "lack of attention to local landscape character" in the applicant's submission and later further expanded upon earlier made recommendations.

4.22 **NYCC – Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Team** – on [17<sup>th</sup> January 2011](#), stated the application site and surrounding area is "poorly served by public rights of way" and noted that both the A1(T) and the River Swale create barriers that are considered to be difficult for users to cross, particularly horse riders and, therefore, the PRoW network would be affected by the proposed development i.e. "footpath 10.78/1/1 crossing the site ending short of Killerby Hall". However, an opportunity exists whereby the proposed development could result in the creation of new accesses and develop links to the wider PRoW network within the area, including the Ellerton site, north of the river. It therefore recommended the following:

- the proposed new bridleways should be a minimum of 3 metres in width and surfaced to a standard agreed with the Highway Authority;
- gates should be a minimum of 1.5 metres wide between the posts and provide access for a horse;
- structures that cross watercourses need to be constructed to the satisfaction of the County Council's Bridges Engineer;
- a commuted sum of money for the maintenance of the surface of the proposed PRoW and associated structures, covering a period of not less than 50 years;
- a new crossing of the River Swale, which includes equestrian access through the site, linking it to the "wider rights of way / quiet lane network"; and,
- create a route along the river edge to the edge of the application site North of Killerby Hall, to help improve connectivity with Catterick Village.

On [28<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#), it was confirmed that the existing PRoW network within the application site must be protected and remain clear of obstruction "until such time as any alternative route has been provided and confirmed under an Order made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990".

4.23 **NYCC adviser on archaeological matters** – on [17<sup>th</sup> January 2011](#) noted that, in terms of prehistoric activity, the application site is situated within an area of "high potential for early prehistoric activity" and welcomed the approach taken by the applicant company's archaeological consultant. With respect to activity from the Mesolithic period, due to the known Mesolithic site of Killerby Mires, it is expected that the applicant company could provide some consideration of the archaeological activity found during the evaluation of the site. Due to the "significance of the of the Killerby Mires site", it considered it important to obtain additional information surrounding the "potential and significance of the resource within the proposed extraction area" and, therefore, welcomed a discussion with the applicant company as to the appropriate techniques that should be applied and the degree of this further work. It noted that English Heritage had previously advised that "the whole of the Mesolithic activity/

*occupation site will need to be thought of holistically, and if any development were to be approved, mitigation would be required for the whole of the archaeological site, irrespective of the redline boundary".* The expressed greatest concern was that of the proposals for direct access to the A1(T) which had *"not been evaluated beyond the single trench evaluated as part of the archaeological evaluation associated with the A1 up-grade"*; especially the single trench having revealed highly significant Mesolithic remains. Therefore, due to the low level of information available, it had not been possible to assign a level of significance to the remains, *"although it can be stated that this is of at least regional importance"* and *"before this application can be progressed, further archaeological evaluation in this area is required"*. The actual *"extent of the Mesolithic activity needs to be established alongside the archaeological potential and significance"*. The response advised liaison between the applicant company and those involved with the A1 improvement works. The applicant company was recommended that it should *"develop an understanding of the character, history and evolution of the local landscape, which would enable fuller appreciation of sensitivity and character and thus assist in understanding the impact of the proposals"* and encouraged liaison with English Heritage as well as NYCC adviser on archaeological matters.

- 4.24 On [28<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#), it was confirmed that, in respect of the additional archaeological information that was submitted, *"the significance of the expected archaeological resource has been determined, and that the level of harm has been established as acceptable"*. It requested that the *Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)* that accompanied the ES (July 2010) should be updated so that any proposed mitigation that is proposed from the applicant company meets the current relevant standards and guidance. The response also noted that this document could then form the basis of a planning condition. A [further response on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2015](#) confirmed the revised WSI to be *"generally acceptable"*. This was followed on [27<sup>th</sup> January 2015](#) by recommended conditions:
- assuring that development is carried out in accordance with the WSI;
  - notification upon completion of the archaeological mitigation fieldwork; and
  - requiring the production of a report, comprising an assessment of the archaeological remains recovered from the site and an outline of the subsequent programme of analyses, publication and archiving.

No further or additional comments above those previously made were offered in response to *the 2016 consultation*.

- 4.25 **NYCC Arboricultural Officer** – on [22<sup>nd</sup> December 2016](#) offered no comments in respect of *the 2016 consultation*.
- 4.26 **Northern Gas Networks** - in its response, dated 12<sup>th</sup> November 2010, Northern Gas Networks draw attention to an existing natural gas pipeline that runs across part of the application site and that discussion would be had

regarding its “*diversion prior to the extraction of minerals in the area around the pipeline easement*”.

4.27 **Environment Agency** - on [16<sup>th</sup> January 2015](#) raised no objection to the proposed development, but recommended conditions covering the following:

- flood-risk conditions:
  - *the site office shall be located within Flood Zone 1;*
  - *any soil storage heaps shall either be located in Flood Zone 1 or in a location where satisfactory compensatory storage has been created; and*
  - *any soil storage heaps located in Flood Zone 3 shall have level for level compensatory storage provided.*
- flood-risk informatives:
  - the proposed works within the application site must be carried out in accordance with the submitted *Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)*;
  - recommend that the applicant company signs up to the Flood Warnings Direct service;
  - consent is required for works affecting a main river/ flood defence, under the Water Resources Act 1991, meaning consent would be required for the two proposed bridges over the main river and the removal of the section of defence for the restoration phase of ‘*Killerby East*’; and
  - consent would be required any proposed works affecting ordinary watercourses and for any input of surface water into the drainage system.
- groundwater conditions:
  - a *Hydrogeological Risk Assessment* should be submitted to the County Planning Authority prior to any development;
  - a scheme should be submitted, which considers dewatering; protection of licensed sources; maintenance of spring-fed flows; and the monitoring of surface water and groundwater;
  - a scheme should be submitted, providing details of the storage of materials and chemicals on-site, method of working, phasing of working, phasing of the development, after-care, landscaping, and details of road and wheel cleaning facilities; and
  - oil interceptor(s) prior to discharge of water to the drainage system would be required.
- groundwater informatives:
  - any activities that can adversely affect groundwater must be considered, including physical disturbance of the aquifer; and
  - the guidance document ‘*Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice*’ (GP3) described the approach that should be taken to the management and protection of groundwater.

The response confirmed these potential risks could be managed subject to the inclusion of suggested conditions in relation to groundwater.

In terms of biodiversity, the response stated “*there is little information provided with regard to the scale of biodiversity enhancements, or the timescales for their delivery and management*”.

- biodiversity conditions:
  - there is little information provided with regard to the scale of biodiversity enhancements, or the timescales for their delivery and management. As such, conditions should be included in any planning permission.

The response also clarified that discussions would be necessary in respect of any Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations.

Informatives were also recommended regarding:

- if an Environmental Permit for water discharge activity were to be required, then they would be advised to contact the National Permitting Service;
- recommend regard be had to the *Swale, Ure, Nidd and Ouse (SUNO) Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS)*;
- the principle of compensating the potential reduction in baseflow (due to dewatering) with a discharge from the settlement lagoon is accepted. However, the “*applicant company would have to ensure that they comply with the aims and objectives of the Water Framework Directive by not causing deterioration of the water bodies*”;
- the applicant company as a waste producer has a duty of care to ensure all materials removed go to an appropriate permitted facility and all relevant documentation is completed and kept in accord with regulations; and
- the applicant company should be satisfied that any proposed domestic foul drainage should comply with the requirements of Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) Circular 03/99 (as amended).

In response to consultation on a specific matter with regard to river erosion, the Agency advised that “*the erosion that is currently occurring on the river bank is a natural process and as such is the responsibility of the riparian owner*”, but nevertheless informed the County Planning Authority that “*any bank strengthening works or works to the River Swale are likely to require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the top of the bank of the River Swale, designated a ‘main river’*”.

- 4.28 **Hackforth and Ainderby Mires and Holtby Parish Council** – on [27<sup>th</sup> October 2014](#), confirmed no comments on the application.
- 4.29 **Kirkby Fleetham with Fencotes Parish Council** - pointed to “*serious errors*” in the *Transport Statement* (May 2014) of the ES relating to the applicant company’s description of directions. The response also questioned the data



used and the findings of the *Transport Statement* (May 2014), claiming it to be “*misleading*”.

- 4.30 **North Yorkshire Local Access Forum** – proposed on [25<sup>th</sup> January 2017](#) that consideration be given to the retention of one of the proposed river crossings following the cessation of mineral extraction for public access purposes.

## 5.0 **ADVERTISEMENTS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 The application was first advertised on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2010 by the erection of Site Notices and a Press Notice in the Darlington & Stockton Times on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010. Neighbour notification letters were also sent to the occupants of nearby properties on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and County Councillor Mr Arthur Baker and County Councillor Mr Carl Les have been notified of the application submissions during the course of the processing of the application.

5.2 Following the receipt of further environmental information received in the months of June, August and October 2014 a second round of consultation, including notification letters to neighbours and County Councillors as well as the posting of a Press Notice, on the 24<sup>th</sup> October 2014, and the erection of Site Notices on the 15<sup>th</sup> October 2014. This further information comprised:

- further archaeological investigation, specifically an ‘*Archaeological Evaluation of Peat Deposit, Killerby Prospect, North Yorkshire*’ (October 2012);
- a *Transport Statement* (May 2014);
- revised Transport Chapter of the Environmental Statement;
- revised ‘*Ecological Baseline Update Survey*’ and ‘*Bird Management Strategy*’ (BMS) (July 2014);
- ‘*Proposed Area of long-term Management Plan*’ (July 2014); and,
- revised ‘*Restoration Masterplan*’ (Rev C, April 2013).

5.3 Following advertisement of the proposed development, representations have been received from the local community raising concerns with regards the proposed development; one of which has subsequently been formally withdrawn having received satisfaction. A summary of the issues contained within the responses are set out below:

- *Land outside of the control of the applicant company*
  - the previous occupants of Killerby Hall “*remain open to negotiation*” with the applicant company for access over their land, which negates the need for bridges over the River Swale;
  - they would not enter into a S106 “*to leave land north of Killerby Hall restored to open water*” requesting the land be restored to agricultural use; and

- noted that proposed tree planting to the “*north west of the extraction area*” would fall outside of the applicant company’s ownership.
- *Traffic and Accessibility*
  - concerned over the access given the fact that the proposed A1 upgrade works were not going ahead<sup>13</sup>;
  - the access to Broad Close Cottage would be affected; an access that was required by the previous occupants of Killerby Hall (via proposed sub-Phase 5D) for farm access. A loss of access would necessitate associated farm traffic to exit onto the A1; and
  - concerned that the “*HGV route described via Leeming Bar would apply to normal motorists as well*”.
- *Planning Policy*
  - questioned why the proposed development wasn’t “*confined to the Area of Search*”.
- *Proposed Mitigation*
  - inadequate screening within the site was thought in the view of the previous occupants of Killerby Hall to result in potential adverse impact upon their amenity and that of other neighbours; and
  - there was limited provision for advance planting and a lack of proposed planting to replace the “*loss of a strip of woodland on the east of Killerby Farm*”.
- *Restoration*
  - concerned that erosion on the banks of the River Swale could potentially result in the banks breaking, with the resultant water flooding the proposed lake and ultimately flooding Killerby Hall and therefore suggesting this part to be restored to agricultural land instead.
- *Processing*
  - the proposed processing of material from Ellerton Quarry should not take place, which would “*minimise disturbance of Killerby Hall*” and negate the need for the proposed bridges over the River Swale; and
  - assurance was sought on behalf of the previous occupants of Killerby Hall from the applicant company to monitor the structural soundness of buildings at the site and that compensation should result from any loss in value.
- *Hydrology*

---

<sup>13</sup> This represented the position in relation to the planned A1 upgrade at the time that the representation was submitted

- the applicant company is obliged to supply water to livestock and thereby “*compensate [the previous occupants of Killerby Hall] for use of water from a mains supply*”;
  - additional information was requested in relation to the proposed raising of land within the site and its potential implications on flood risk;
  - concern was raised from West Lowfield Farm that the applicant company’s intention to allow water to flow from the River Swale “*into the hole created by the extraction*” would increase the risk of flooding to North Lowfield Farm, adjacent cottage and Kirkby Hall; and
  - concerned about the potential impact upon the water table, “*which could damage the quality of surrounding agricultural land*”.
- *Plant and Machinery*
    - Questioned the justification for the location of the proposed processing plant area within close proximity to Killerby Hall stating this should be relocated further east within the proposed quarry.
- *Residential Amenity*
    - concerned about potential noise impacts, stating that the “*noise assessment is a prediction*” and questioned how noise levels would be monitored;
    - questioned why “*guidance noise levels will be exceeded (in relation to periods of excessive noise generating activities)*”; and
    - pointed to a lack of reference to potential impacts on air quality and questioned whether there will be “*monitoring of on-site dust mitigation measures in place*”; seeking assurances that the applicant company had adequate monitoring measures in place.

5.4 A letter, dated [14<sup>th</sup> March 2012](#), to the applicant company on behalf of the County Planning Authority, set out suggested actions to address the representations and the issues they had raised. Appendix A of the letter provided a summary of the issues raised by local residents during the first round of neighbour notification.

5.5 The agent representing the applicant company responded to this correspondence, in a letter dated 26<sup>th</sup> March 2012. This response provided clarification of details on certain topics raised from the local community resulting from the first round of neighbour notifications. The agent’s response in this case covered the following topics:

- potential land ownership agreement with the previous occupants of Killerby Hall in relation to the overland movement of sand and gravel to the proposed Plant Site;
- the functional requirements of the proposed bridges;
- boundary tree planting and on-site screening as part of proposed mitigation and the ownership of the associated land;
- maintained access to Broad Close Cottage;

- alternatives considered within the ES relating to the proposed restoration of the site;
- justification for the location of the processing plant area and associated visual and landscape mitigation;
- revisions to the proposed *Restoration Masterplan* to take into account consultation responses, in relation to indicating the extent of undisturbed woodland, and shingle banks along the River Swale; the introduction of alder willow carr in place of reeds; and not reinstating hedgerows around the southern proposed lake in order to “*maintain the openness*” of this part of the application site;
- justification for processing material extracted from Ellerton Quarry and the associated traffic implications of omitting the need “*for vehicle movement on the B6271 which has been a long term issue with residents along this road*”;
- with regard to potential structural damage, the proposed operations would be located at a sufficient distance from Killerby Hall such that it was considered structural damage was “*not likely to occur*”.
- overburden mounds are temporary and the applicant company did not intend to raise the land permanently in proximity to Killerby Farm;
- floodbank defences to the River Swale would be maintained and the EA had identified “*the potential of Killerby East Lake to contribute to flood water storage and flood alleviation of areas downstream of the site and would lessen the risk to Kirkby Hall*”;
- the potential impacts of dewatering and groundwater monitoring had been assessed within the ES (July 2010);
- noise had been assessed on “*information provided by the equipment manufacturers*” and the applicant company would establish a Liaison Group for Killerby Quarry;
- the proposed routing for HGV’s from the quarry would be directed southbound on the A1 to Leeming Bar;
- the postponed upgrade of the A1 did not alter the proposed access to the application site and the proposed junction designed in accordance with appropriate standards;
- the Area of Search had been identified by the County Planning Authority in the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (NYMLP) (adopted 1997) to “*make provision for sand and gravel resources*”; and
- the potential for dust from the proposed development “*would be actively controlled through rigorous site management in accordance with Tarmac’s Environmental Management Policy*”.

5.6 In response to the letter from the agent, representations, sent on behalf the previous occupants of Killerby Hall, were received by the County Planning Authority comprising:

- acknowledged the applicant’s agent’s confirmation that “*no tree planting is proposed on the surface owned by the previous occupants of Killerby Hall*”;

- considered “*that a resolution can be found by better use of earth banking before planting*”;
- they enjoyed “*an unencumbered vehicular right of access south from Killerby Hall to access the road network adjacent to Broad Close Cottage*”. However, they were “*prepared to discuss alternatives to this route with Tarmac, but it is required for farm traffic which otherwise has to exit the farm onto the road network using the existing A1, with consequent highway implications*”;
- they did not agree with the proposed restoration proposals for ‘Killerby West’ and would “*not be party to a section 106 agreement which does not restore this land to agricultural use*”, noting that the agent had “*not addressed the implications of creating more open water within the protection zone of RAF Leeming*” and had “*not addressed the concerns that the River Swale will erode and eventually flood the adjacent land once it lies at a lower level*”;
- the agent hadn’t addressed “*the concerns of the adjacent residential occupants*”;
- proposed that “*the strip of woodland on the on the east side of Killerby Farm which falls into extraction area 2b is retained*”;
- maintained that proposed material from Ellerton Quarry should remain at Ellerton to avoid the need for the proposed bridges over the River Swale;
- the agent hasn’t addressed “*how fuel, supplies, and staff will access this area, but only comments that it will not arrive over the River bridge*” and they stated that “*access to the A1 west of Killerby Farm is unsuitable for the type and volume of access proposed and further details are required*”.
- sought reassurances “*over the maintenance of a water supply*”;
- remained concerned over potential structural damage to Killerby Hall and “*other adjacent residential properties*”; and
- still required an assessment of the potential impact on land drainage within the area.

5.7 On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2013, correspondence was also received on behalf of the owners of Broad Close Farm and the occupants of Broad Close Farmhouse and associated buildings. The letter confirmed that “*there is no contractual relationship*” with the occupants with regard to potential effects upon the buildings from the proposed development. The correspondence also raised the potential for noise disturbance on the properties in question from the proposed Plant Site and associated processing activities.

5.8 A further representation (dated 6<sup>th</sup> January 2017) in respect of the proposed development was received by the County Planning Authority on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017 followed by a supplementary dated 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017 raising the following issues:

- property values and recent property purchase;
- working & restoration schemes;
- RAF Leeming;

- employment;
- traffic;
- noise and dust effects upon residential properties;
- agricultural land classification and food production;
- public access and early public benefit;
- potential company failure;
- necessity/principle of the development;
- consultation process; and,
- ecology and access.

## **6.0 PLANNING GUIDANCE AND POLICY**

6.1 Our planning system is a plan-led system. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>14</sup> places a duty upon the decision-maker to ensure that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In considering the application, other material considerations need to be taken into account. Such other important considerations include other relevant policy and guidance, particularly national planning policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant Government policy statements, as well as that which is provided within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Where relevant, key policy and guidance to the determination of this application is identified in this section of the report.

### *The Development Plan*

6.2 In this particular instance, the *Development Plan* comprises the ‘saved’ policies of the [North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan](#) (NYMLP) (insofar as having been ‘saved’ by Direction of the Secretary of State in 2007) and the extant policies of these two areas; namely, those within the adopted [Richmondshire Local Plan](#) (2014) and the adopted *Hambleton Development Plan* comprising [the Core Strategy](#) (2007), [Development Policies](#) Development Plan Document (DPD) (February 2008), and [Allocations Plan](#) DPD (2010).

6.3 The consideration of local development plan documents relating to two administrative areas, namely Richmondshire and Hambleton, arises due to the planning application area straddling the boundary between the two local planning areas.

6.4 Where Local Plans have not been updated to take into account the policies in the NPPF, as is the case with the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan ‘saved’ policies, due weight should be given to relevant policies in such plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework (that is to say, the closer the policies in the Local Plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given) (Paragraph 215 of the NPPF refers). As such, the relevant ‘saved’ policies of the NYMLP have been reviewed in light

---

<sup>14</sup> Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act: 2004 Chapter 5.

of the policies of the NPPF in order to determine their relevance to the assessment of the current proposal. It is considered that the relevant 'saved' policies of the NYMLP are broadly consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

6.5 Members are asked to note that, where appropriate to do so, extracts rather than full reproduction of policy text has been used for the purpose of the preparation of this report. Should Members wish to read the full text of the policies themselves and their reasoned justification, the weblinks to the documents in which they are contained are provided below:

- [North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan](#) (policies 'saved' by Direction 2007);
- [Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy](#) (adopted 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014);
- Hambleton Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which comprise:
  - [the Core Strategy](#) (2007);
  - [Development Policies DPD](#) (February 2008); and,
  - [Allocations Plan DPD](#) (2010).

#### North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan 'saved' policies

6.6 The Planning and Compensation Act (1991) placed a duty on each County Council in England and Wales to prepare a Minerals Local Plan. The North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan was adopted in 1997 under the 1991 Act. In the absence of an adopted Minerals Core Strategy and, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as of 27<sup>th</sup> September 2007 only the 'saved' policies continue to form part of the statutory 'Development Plan' and provide an important part of the current local planning policy framework for development control decisions for minerals-related development.

6.7 The principal relevant 'saved' policies of the NYMLP comprise:

- *mineral extraction and resource protection:*
  - 'saved' Policy 3/2 Preferred Areas;
  - 'saved' Policy 3/3 Areas of Search;
  - 'saved' Policy 3/4 Other areas;
- *environmental considerations:*
  - 'saved' Policy 4/1 determination of planning applications;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/6a local nature conservation & habitat protection;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/10 water protection;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/13 traffic impact;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/14 local environment and amenity;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/15 public rights of way;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/16 secondary and ancillary facilities;
  - 'saved' Policy 4/18 restoration; and,
  - 'saved' Policy 4/20 after-care.
- *aggregate minerals:*
  - 'saved' Policy 5/1 sand and gravel landbanks

6.8 'Saved' Policy 3/2 ('Preferred Areas') states "in order to maintain landbanks of permitted reserves, proposals for aggregates mineral working in Preferred

*Areas will be regarded as acceptable in principle. Satisfactory details will have to be submitted before planning permission can be granted”.*

- 6.9 The NPPF states that planning authorities “*should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by making provision for the land-won and other elements of their Local Aggregate Assessment in their mineral plans taking account of the advice of the Aggregate Working Parties and the National Aggregate Coordinating Group as appropriate*”. It then states that “*such provision should take the form of specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria as appropriate*”. It is, therefore, considered that this ‘*saved*’ policy is consistent with the NPPF.
- 6.10 **‘*Saved*’ Policy 3/3** (‘*Areas of Search*’) states planning permission “*may be granted for aggregate mineral working within Areas of Search where the Mineral Planning Authority is satisfied that sufficient mineral cannot be obtained from the Preferred Areas*”.
- 6.11 The supporting text to this ‘*saved*’ policy also states that the “*County Council considers that limited extraction around an existing quarry can be acceptable in principle to avoid either sterilising a resource or re-starting working at a later date after mineral working in the existing quarry has ceased. Such proposals will need to be assessed against the other policies in the Plan*”.
- 6.12 As discussed above, in relation to ‘*saved*’ Policy 3/2, the NPPF advocates a “*steady and reliable supply of aggregates*” and upon review, it is considered that this ‘*saved*’ policy is also consistent with the NPPF.
- 6.13 **‘*Saved*’ Policy 3/4** (‘*Other Areas*’) states that outside ‘*preferred areas*’ and ‘*areas of search*’, “*planning permission for aggregate mineral working will normally only be granted for borrow pits and small-scale extensions to existing sites*”.
- 6.14 Again, as with ‘*saved*’ Policy 3/3 discussed above, it is considered that the principal of this ‘*saved*’ policy is consistent with the aims of the NPPF in maintaining a supply of aggregates and is therefore in keeping with the aims of the NPPF.
- ‘environmental considerations’*
- 6.15 **‘*Saved*’ Policy 4/1** establishes (in addition to the focus of ‘*saved*’ policies 4/6a, 4/10, 4/14 and 4/15) the criteria against which applications for minerals-related development are to be assessed as follows:
- (a) the mineral deposit on the application site has been fully investigated;*
  - (b) the siting and scale of the proposal is acceptable;*
  - (c) the proposed method and programme of working would minimise the impact of the proposal;*
  - (d) landscaping and screening has been designed to effectively mitigate the impact of the proposal;*
  - (e) other environmental and amenity safeguards would effectively mitigate the impact of the proposals;*



- (f) the proposals and programme for restoration are acceptable and would allow a high standard to be achieved;*
- (g) a high standard of aftercare and management of the land could be achieved;*
- (h) the proposed transport links to move the mineral to market are acceptable;*  
*and*
- (i) any cumulative impact on the local area resulting from the proposal is acceptable”.*

- 6.16 While the NPPF is silent in respect of the matters raised at criteria (a), (b), (c), and (d), Paragraph 144 of the NPPF empathises with criterion (e) in stating that *“when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that any unavoidable emissions or vibrations are controlled or mitigated (if it is not possible to remove them at source)”*. It is, therefore, considered that this criterion of the ‘saved’ policy is consistent with the NPPF and can therefore be given weight. Criteria (f) and (g) are reflected within Paragraph 144 of the NPPF in requiring provision for *“restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary”* which ensures consistency with the NPPF. With regard to criterion (h), there is no conflict with the NPPF, but Paragraph 32 of the NPPF goes beyond this by seeking decisions which take into account whether improvements to the transport network can be undertaken that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of a proposed development going further still to indicate that development should only be prevented or refused on such grounds where the residual cumulative impact would be severe. Therefore, the NPPF is to be given more weight than criterion (h). Finally, criterion (i) is consistent with Paragraph 144 of the NPPF in taking into account cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or effects from a number of sites in a locality.
- 6.17 **‘Saved’ Policy 4/6a** consistent with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF (which encourages contributions to and enhancement of the natural and local environment by reducing biodiversity impacts) seeks to *“protect the nature conservation or geological interest of Local Nature Reserves and of other sites having a nature conservation interest or importance, and will have regard to other wildlife habitats”*.
- 6.18 **‘Saved’ Policy 4/10**, again consistent with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF, seeks to ensure only proposals which do not pose unacceptable surface or groundwater resource impacts are permitted and is, furthermore, consistent with Paragraph 143 of the NPPF which states that *“...local planning authorities should: set out environmental criteria, in line with the policies in this Framework, against which planning applications will be assessed so as to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on... the flow and quantity of surface and groundwater and migration of contamination from the site”*.
- 6.19 **‘Saved’ Policy 4/13** considers the potential of traffic impact when considering new development proposals. In particular, the ‘saved’ policy states that *“mining operations [...] will only be permitted where the level of vehicle movements likely to be generated can be satisfactorily accommodated by the local highway*

*network*". When assessing this policy's consistency with the NPPF there are differences in objectives. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF specifically states that improvements to the transport network should be considered and it is, therefore, considered that the NPPF should be given more weight than this 'saved' NYMLP policy.

- 6.20 **'Saved' Policy 4/14** considers proposed development against potential impacts on the local environment and amenity requiring proposals to be permitted "*only where there would not be an unacceptable impact on the local environment or residential amenity*". Again, this is consistent with Paragraph 109 of the NPPF which requires proposals do not give rise to an unacceptable impact upon the local environment or residential amenity and, similarly, Paragraph 144 of the NPPF requires authorities to "*ensure, in granting planning permission for mineral development, that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality*".
- 6.21 In instances where a proposed development would give rise to the interruption, obstruction or conflict with a public right of way (PRoW), 'saved' Policy 4/15 states it would "*only be permitted where satisfactory provision has been made in the application for protecting the existing right of way or for providing alternative arrangements both during and after working*". This policy's consistency with the NPPF can be found within Paragraph 75 which states that "*policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access*" and that "*opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails*" should be sought.
- 6.22 **'Saved' Policy 4/16** considers the environmental implications of ancillary aspects of development upon the environment, which in the case of this application would include the proposed conveyor system and processing plant. The 'saved' policy states that proposals will be expected to be "*sited, designed and maintained so as to minimise the impact on the environment and local amenity. The use of plant, machinery and buildings will be restricted to processes primarily using minerals produced from the site. Permission will normally be limited to the permitted life of the site for mineral extraction*". Similar to the considerations in respect of 'saved' Policy 4/14 above, 'saved' Policy 4/16 is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.
- 6.23 **'Saved' Policy 4/18** is also considered relevant to this application given the proposed restoration to agricultural land (in part). The Policy states, where agriculture is the intended primary afteruse, "*the proposed restoration scheme should provide for the best practicable standard of restoration. Such restoration schemes should, where possible, include landscape, conservation or amenity proposals provided that these do not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile land*". Policy consistency with the NPPF is achieved when one considers Paragraph 144 of the NPPF which states, when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should "*provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary*".

It is considered that the principle of what the policy says in relation to restoration of land to agricultural use is relevant and renders the 'saved' Policy, NPPF-consistent.

- 6.24 Embedded within policy for minerals development proposals is the long-term after-care of sites, 'saved' Policy 4/20 is engaged in this instance with a proposed agricultural after-use. The after-care requirement seeks to "*bring the restored land up to an approved standard for the specified after-use. Normally this requirement will run for a period of five years following restoration*" and, like 'saved' Policy 4/18, above is also consistent with Paragraph 144 of the NPPF.

Aggregate minerals

- 6.25 '**Saved** Policy 5/1 relates to the future demand for sand and gravel within the county and states that the County Council "*will identify three landbanks for calculating sand and gravel provision, as follows:-*  
*a) Sand and gravel (Northwards);*  
*b) Sand and gravel (Southwards); and*  
*c) Building sand.*  
*In determining which of the landbanks for sand and gravel a site falls within, the County Council will take into account the geographical location of the site and the likely external markets for the material*".

- 6.26 The 'saved' policy is also policy in keeping with the aims of the NPPF in maintaining a supply of aggregates and so is therefore considered to be NPPF-consistent.

Richmondshire Local Plan (2014) (relevant insofar as the former Ellerton site)

- 6.27 While this policy document contains no policies directly relating to planning decisions in respect of minerals and/or waste-related development proposals which are 'county matters', it nevertheless forms an integral part of the relevant *Development Plan* against which the current application must be assessed.

- 6.28 The Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy was adopted on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014 and provides the long-term strategic vision for how the District will be shaped by setting out a number of broad policies to guide development.

- 6.29 The policies considered of most relevance to determining this particular application comprise:
- Policy CP1 Planning positively;
  - Policy CP2 Responding to climate change;
  - Policy CP3 Achieving sustainable development;
  - Policy CP11 Supporting community, cultural and recreational assets;
  - Policy CP12 Conserving and enhancing environmental and historic assets;
  - Policy CP13 Promoting high quality design

- 6.30 **Policy CP1** of the Core Strategy states that "*when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicant companys jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved*

wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the plan area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan... will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise - taking into account whether:

- any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, taken as a whole;
- specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted”.

- 6.31 Part 3 of **Policy CP2** considers climate change adaptation and states that:  
“All new development will be expected to be adaptable to climate change in terms of both its location and the specific design and layout of buildings and associated external spaces. Development proposals should: ...  
c. be steered away from flood risk areas by adopting a sequential approach as set out in prevailing national guidance  
d. be designed to minimise flood risk on-site and elsewhere, by:
- incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) unless they aren demonstrated to be impracticable or they will pose an unacceptable pollution risk. SuDS should minimise surface water flood risk, protect waterways and provide aesthetic and ecological benefits
  - not building over or culverting watercourses unless it is to facilitate essential access
  - encouraging the opening of existing culverts. ...
- e. show how development will seek to minimise waste production”.

- 6.32 **Policy CP3** sets out criteria from which developments will be assessed to determine levels of sustainability. This policy states that:
1. Support will be given for sustainable development which promotes:...
- c. the health, economic and social well-being, amenity and safety of the population...
  - e. the quality of natural resources including water, air, land and biodiversity and minimises the impacts of airborne pollution...
  - f. the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land
  - g. the natural drainage of surface water mitigating the effects of flash flooding of rivers, drains and drought...
  - j. the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside...
  - l. the historic, environmental and cultural features of acknowledged importance. ...
3. Development will be encouraged to utilise previously developed land first (brownfield land), where that land is in a sustainable location and is not of high environmental value, in preference to greenfield sites. The use and development of land will be assessed against the community’s housing, economic and social requirements. The sustainability and enhancement of the natural and built environment, minimisation of energy consumption and the need to travel will also be key factors. Development that would

*significantly harm the natural or built environment, or that would generate a significant adverse traffic impact, without appropriate mitigation, will not be permitted”.*

6.33 **Policy CP11** seeks to protect Richmondshire’s community, cultural and recreation assets. This policy specifically states that:

1. *“Support will be given to proposals that help create, protect, retain or enhance community, cultural and recreational assets (land and/or buildings) that:*

*c. provide additional assets...*

3. *All new development will be expected to:*

*a. plan positively to ensure the provision and integration of sufficient quality community, cultural and recreational assets for existing and future occupiers and recreational facilities, including formal and informal, equipped and unequipped areas for open space, sport and recreation and links to Public Rights of Way”.*

6.34 **Policy CP12** states *“Development or other initiatives will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance of the plan area’s natural and man-made, designated or undesignated assets. Development will not be supported which:*

*a. has a detrimental impact upon the significance of a natural or man-made asset; and*

*b. is inconsistent with the principles of an asset’s proper management.*

**Environmental Assets**

*Where avoidance of adverse impacts is not possible, necessary mitigation must be provided to address any potential harmful implications of development. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures will be required. This approach will apply to specific assets as follows:...*

*b ...the landscape character of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to ensure a sustainable future for the natural and historic environment*

*c the biodiversity and geodiversity of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to ensure a sustainable future for the natural environment in support of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Biodiversity Strategy, the North Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan, the Richmondshire Biodiversity Action Plan and the Humber River Basin Management Plan. Particular support will be given to initiatives to improve the natural environment where it is poor and lacking in diversity*

*d the green infrastructure network of the plan area will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced to provide a high quality, accessible, diverse and well-connected network of green space to meet the needs of the community, businesses and visitors. The key green infrastructure network includes:*

*iii ...corridors of green space, recreation areas and trees which flow through urban areas (particularly Catterick Garrison and Leyburn)...*

*vii ...woodlands, scrubland, grassland, wetland, running water, wasteland, open land and parks and gardens, river banks, cycleways and the Public Rights of Way network*

*viii sites important for biodiversity and geodiversity ...”.*

### Historic Assets

1. *Those elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets across the Plan area will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced...*
2. *Where a proposal is likely to result in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and there are compelling reasons for allowing that development, opportunities will be sought to offset this harm by ensuring that other elements which contribute to the significance of that particular asset are enhanced or their significance better revealed”.*

- 6.35 **Policy CP13** relates to design and seeks to ensure that high design standards are maintained throughout the district. Specifically this policy states that *“high quality design of both buildings and landscaping is a priority in all development proposals. Support will be given for proposals that:*
- b. respect and enhance the local context and its special qualities, including its design features, landscape, social activities, historic environment and nationally and locally recognised designation.*
  - c. optimise the potential of the site”.*

### Hambleton District Development Plan (relevant insofar as the area south of the river)

- 6.36 While the documents comprising *the Development Plan* prepared by Hambleton District Council contain no policies directly relating to planning decisions in respect of minerals and/or waste-related development proposals which are ‘*county matters*’, they nevertheless form an integral part of the relevant *Development Plan* against which the current application must be assessed. The documents contain general development management policies and a number are relevant to the determination of this application.

- 6.37 The statutory *Development Plan* for Hambleton comprises the Hambleton Core Strategy (2007), the Development Policies DPD (2008) and the Allocations DPD (2010) all of which were adopted before publication of the NPPF in 2012. However, they can be taken for the purpose of this Committee Report to be the Local Planning Authority’s most up-to-date Development Plan policy to be used when determining planning applications. In the absence of an NPPF compliance statement prepared by Hambleton District Council, this Committee Report has undertaken an assessment of the relevant policies against the NPPF, in accordance with Paragraph 215 of the NPPF.

### Hambleton Core Strategy (2007)

- 6.38 The Core Strategy policies considered of most relevance to determining this particular application comprise:
- Policy CP1 Sustainable development;
  - Policy CP16 Protecting and enhancing natural and man-made assets;
  - Policy CP17 Promoting high quality design;
  - Policy CP19 Recreational facilities and amenity open space;
  - Policy CP21 Safe response to natural and other forces.

- 6.39 Core Strategy **Policy CP1** looks at meeting local development needs in a sustainable way. In particular, it states that *“the use and development of land will be assessed against the community’s housing, economic and social*

*requirements, protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment and minimisation of energy consumption and the need to travel. Development that would significantly harm the natural or built environment, or that would generate an adverse traffic impact, will not be permitted. Proposals will be supported if they promote and encourage or protect and enhance:*

- iii. the health, economic and social well-being, amenity and safety of the population;...*
- v. the quality of natural resources including water, air, land and biodiversity;*
- vi. the natural drainage of surface water;*
- vii. the vitality of the area;*
- viii. a high quality and adaptability of development;*
- ix. the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside;*
- x. the distinctiveness, character, townscape and setting of settlements;*
- xi. the historic and cultural features of acknowledged importance”.*

6.40 It is considered that limited weight can be attached to the transport aspect of Policy CP1 as the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe and, therefore, only limited weight may be given in this instance. However, it is considered that full weight can be awarded to the other aspects of the policy as they are considered to be consistent with the environmental protection aims of the NPPF.

6.41 Core Strategy **Policy CP16** addresses how to maintain quality environments. In particular, it states that development or other initiatives *‘will be supported where they preserve and enhance the District’s natural and manmade assets, where appropriate defined in the Development Policies Development Plan Document and identified on the Proposals Map. Particular support will be given to initiatives to improve the natural environment where it is poor and lacking in diversity.*

*Development or activities will not be supported which:*

- i. has a detrimental impact upon the interests of a natural or man-made asset;*
- ii. is inconsistent with the principles of an asset’s proper management;*
- iii. is contrary to the necessary control of development within nationally or locally designated areas.*

*Any necessary mitigating or compensatory measures must be provided to address potential harmful implications of development”.*

6.42 This Core Strategy policy is considered broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as outlined within Section 11 of the NPPF, specifically in relation to Paragraph 109 which outlines the importance of providing net gains in biodiversity. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.43 Core Strategy **Policy CP17** looks at promoting high quality design and states that *“the requirement to achieve a high quality of design of both buildings and landscaping is a priority in the case of all development proposals. Support will be given for proposals that are consistent with the LDF’s detailed design policies and meet all the following requirements:*

- i. *provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe and low maintenance development;*
  - ii *respect and enhance the local context and its special qualities, including its urban design, landscape, social activities and historic environment, and incorporate public art where appropriate;*
  - ii. *optimise the potential of the site”.*
- 6.44 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives for requiring good design as outlined within Section 7 of the NPPF which emphasises the government’s stance on the design of the built environment. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.45 This policy is also considered broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment outlined within Section 11 of the NPPF.
- 6.46 Core Strategy **Policy CP19** considers the need to provide sufficient recreational space. The policy states that *“Support will be given to proposals and activities that protect, retain or enhance existing recreational and amenity assets, lead to the provision of additional assets, or improve access to facilities, particularly by non-car modes of transport. This will include support for greater access to and enjoyment of the countryside”.*
- 6.47 This policy is considered broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of ‘Promoting Healthy Communities’ as outlined within Section 8 of the NPPF, specifically in relation to Paragraph 70 which outlines the importance of delivering recreational facilities. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.48 Core Strategy **Policy CP21** considers potential contributions to protecting people and the environment from the consequences of natural or other forces including, for example, the risk of flooding. In particular, the policy states that *“development and service provision must seek to ensure that communities and the environment are not adversely affected by the actions of natural or other forces. Proposals must take particular account of the need to:*
- i. *ensure protection from, and not worsen the potential for, flooding;*
  - ii. *mitigate development from the consequences of pollution, noise or hazardous activities”.*
- 6.49 This policy is also considered broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of meeting the challenge of flooding as outlined in Section 10 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.50 Hambleton Development Polices DPD (2008)  
The Development Policies DPD (2008) sets out detailed policies for controlling development and delivering the vision, objectives and core planning policies of the Core Strategy DPD.



- 6.51 The policies within the Development Policies DPD considered of most relevance to determining this particular application comprise:
- Policy DP1 Protecting amenity;
  - Policy DP2 Securing developer contributions;
  - Policy DP28 Conservation;
  - Policy DP29 Archaeology;
  - Policy DP30 Protecting the character & appearance of the countryside
  - Policy DP31 Protecting natural resources;
  - Policy DP32 General design;
  - Policy DP33 Landscaping;
  - Policy DP37 Open space, sport and recreation;
  - Policy DP38 Major outdoor recreation;
  - Policy DP43 Flooding and floodplains; and,
  - Policy DP44 Very noisy activities.
- 6.52 Development **Policy DP1** relates to the preservation of amenity. Specifically, this policy states that *“all development proposals must adequately protect amenity, particularly with regard to privacy, security, noise and disturbance, pollution (including light pollution), odours and daylight...  
...Developments must not unacceptably reduce the existing level of amenity space about buildings, particularly dwellings, and not unacceptably affect the amenity of residents or occupants”*.
- 6.53 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as outlined within section 11 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.54 Development **Policy DP2** seeks to ensure that developers provide necessary financial contributions towards facilitating sustainable development. Specifically, this policy states that *“contributions from developers will be sought where necessary to ensure the achievement of sustainable development, including the provision of additional infrastructure whenever there is a need generated by the new development. These could include, where appropriate, provision of: ...*
- ii. landscaping, of the setting of development, and related areas;...*
  - viii additional highway or transport infrastructure, including support for public and community transport initiatives, footpaths, cycleways and links to or creation of new public rights of way;...*
  - x flood protection measures and sustainable drainage systems;*
  - xi. habitat creation such as ponds, wetlands or wildlife corridors;...”*
- 6.55 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF’s guidance on imposing planning conditions and obligations. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.56 Development **Policy DP28** seeks to ensure that the heritage assets within the district are protected from adverse development impacts. Specifically, this policy states that *“conservation of the historic heritage will be ensured by:*

- i. *preserving and enhancing Listed Buildings; ...*
- iv. *protecting and preserving any other built or landscape feature or use which contributes to the heritage of the District.*

*Development within or affecting the feature or its setting should seek to preserve or enhance all aspects that contribute to its character and appearance, in accordance with the national legislation that designates the feature, and in the case of a Conservation Area, any appraisal produced for that Area. Permission will be granted, where this is consistent with the conservation of the feature, for its interpretation and public enjoyment, and developments refused which could prejudice its restoration.*

*Particularly important considerations will include the position and massing of new development in relation to the particular feature, and the materials and design utilised”.*

6.57 This policy is considered broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of conserving and enhancing the historic environment as outlined under Section 12 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.58 Development **Policy DP29** seeks to ensure that historic assets are appropriately represented when determining planning applications. Specifically this policy states that *“the preservation or enhancement of archaeological remains and their settings will be supported, taking account of the significance of the remains as follows:*

- i. *in the case of Scheduled Monuments (shown on the Proposals Map) and other nationally important archaeological sites and their settings, by operating a presumption in favour of their preservation; and*
- ii. *in the case of other remains of lesser significance, development affecting the site and its setting will only be permitted where the need for development and other material considerations outweigh the importance of the remains. Such remains should be preserved in situ. Where this is not justifiable or feasible, appropriate and satisfactory arrangements will be required for the excavation and recording of the archaeological remains and the publication of the results.*

*In areas of known for potential archaeological interest, an appropriate assessment and evaluation must be submitted to accompany any development proposals....”.*

6.59 This policy is considered broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of conserving and enhancing the historic environment as outlined under Section 12 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.60 Development **Policy DP30** seeks to ensure that the local landscape is protected from adverse impacts as a result of development. Specifically, this policy states that *“the openness, intrinsic character and quality of the District’s landscape will be respected and where possible enhanced... Throughout the District, the design and location of new development should take account of landscape character and its surroundings, and not have a detrimental effect on the immediate environment and on any important long distance views.*

*The design of buildings, and the acceptability of development, will need to take full account of the nature and distinctive qualities of the local landscape. The use of techniques such as landscape character analysis to establish the local importance, and the key features that should be protected and enhanced, will be supported.*

*Where possible opportunities should be taken to add appropriate character and distinctiveness through the contribution of new landscape features, particularly to landscapes which otherwise lack interest”.*

6.61 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as outlined in Section 11 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.62 Development **Policy DP31** seeks to ensure that habitats are protected. Specifically, this policy states that permission *‘will not be granted for development which would cause significant harm to sites and habitats of nature conservation, geological or geomorphological value, together with species that are protected or under threat. Support will be given (and permission granted for related development, if also acceptable in terms of other LDF policies) to the enhancement and increase in number of sites and habitats of nature conservation value, and in particular to meeting objectives identified in the proposals of the Biodiversity Action Plan.*

*Sites designated under national legislation are shown on the Proposals Map (Sites of Special Scientific Interest - SSSIs, and Local Nature Reserves - LNRs), and will be protected under the terms of that legislation. Locally important sites are also identified (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – SINC)s and will be protected and enhanced as appropriate to their local importance. Outside the areas designated, the interests of nature conservation must be taken into account, in accordance with national guidance...*

*...The restoration or creation of new habitats will be supported (and permission granted for related development, if also acceptable in terms of other LDF policies) where these contribute to the Biodiversity Action Plan, and to the targets, priorities and enhancement proposals of the RSS”.*

6.63 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as outlined under Chapter 11 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.64 Development **Policy DP32** provides a design framework for development across the district. Specifically, this policy states that *“the design of all developments must be of the highest quality. Attention to the design quality of all development will be essential, and the submission of design statements supporting and explaining the design components of all relevant proposals will be required.*

*Development proposals must seek to achieve creative, innovative and sustainable designs that take into account local character and settings, and promote local identity and distinctiveness, and reflect the following principles: movement ...*

- v. ...where the nature of development permits, a framework of connected spaces should be developed that respects all users by offering a safe attractive environment for all;  
form....
- vi. proposals must respect local character and distinctiveness (including that of the surrounding landscape, in accordance with Policy DP33) by enhancing its positive attributes whilst mitigating its negative aspects;...
- ix.... development should take every opportunity to create good design that respects and safeguards key views, roofscapes, landmarks, and focal points;  
...
- xii.... sustainable forms of development should be designed, incorporating sustainable energy use (as indicated by Policy DP34), minimising waste production and providing opportunities for recycling (as indicated by Policy DP36), and minimising pollution. Developments should seek to minimise water use (including through the incorporation of grey-water recycling), and where possible include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS). Use or re-use of sustainable materials will be encouraged. Orientation and layout of development should maximise the potential for passive solar heating, taking account of the implications of solar heat gain;  
space....
- xviii.design should seek to retain existing important species and habitats and maximise opportunities for habitat enhancement, creation and management, in accordance with Policy DP31”.

6.65 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of requiring good design as outlined under Section 7 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.66 Development **Policy DP33** seeks to ensure that appropriate landscaping schemes are incorporated into development proposals. Specifically, this policy states that “*landscaping of new development must be an integrated part of the overall design, which complements and enhances development, and:*

- i. *creates a visually pleasant, sustainable and biodiversity-rich environment;*
- ii. *provides for sustainable solutions including the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS). Designs should respond to the potential implications of climate change. The use of sustainable construction materials will be encouraged;*
- iii. *protects and enhances key landscape features;*
- iv. *creates new features and areas of open space that reflect local landscape character;*
- v. *contributes to character, appearance and sense of place;*
- vi. *promotes a public realm which is rich in identity, attractive and safe”.*

6.67 This policy is considered broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of requiring good design as outlined under Section 7 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.

6.68 Development **Policy DP37** seeks to provide support for developments that will provide outdoor recreational facilities. However, this policy also acknowledges

that in order to gain local support proposals will need to satisfy other relevant Local Plan policies.

- 6.69 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF's objectives of promoting healthy communities as outlined under Section 8 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this review application.
- 6.70 Development **Policy DP38** provides a framework for assessing outdoor recreation development. Specifically, this policy states that the provision of appropriate forms of major outdoor recreation *'will be promoted which meet the needs of residents and users (and permission granted for related development, if also acceptable in terms of other LDF policies), provided that all the following apply:*
- i. the development is appropriate to its setting and within the capacity of the local environment and infrastructure, and detrimental implications for amenity and the environment are reduced to an acceptable level;*
  - ii. necessary mitigation measures are included;*
  - iii. the development is accessible to all potential users, including by non-car modes;*
  - iv. conflicts between different activities can be resolved (e.g. by separation in space or time)''.*
- 6.71 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of promoting healthy communities as outlined within Section 8 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.72 Development **Policy DP43** seeks to ensure that development proposals take proactive steps to ensure that risk from flooding is not increased within the district. Specifically, this policy states that *"development proposals will not be permitted where they would have an adverse effect on watercourses or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere...  
...Mitigation and relief measures will be supported which reduce the risk of flooding of existing development (and permission granted for related development, if also acceptable in terms of other LDF policies), and if necessary will be required through developer contributions, in accordance with Policy DP2''.*
- 6.73 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF objectives of meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change as outlined within Section 10 of the NPPF. Therefore, full weight is given to this policy in the determination of this application.
- 6.74 Development **Policy DP44** seeks to ensure that increased noise pollution as a result of development does not negatively impact on local amenity. Specifically, this policy states that *"noise sensitive development will not be permitted in areas where potential for harmful noise levels is known to exist. Development likely to generate harmful noise levels will be directed to appropriate locations away from known noise sensitive locations''.*

- 6.75 This policy is considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF’s objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as outlined within Section 11, and specifically Paragraph 123 of the NPPF.

Other material considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

- 6.76 National planning policy relevant to this planning application is contained within the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) published in March 2012. While the NPPF does not form part of the *Development Plan*, it nevertheless is an important material consideration in the determination of applications.
- 6.77 The NPPF indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, with the system required to perform an economic, social and environmental role, with gains across all three of these broad objectives being sought simultaneously. It sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development which, for decision taking, means approving applications that accord with the Development Plan without delay. **Paragraph 12** of the NPPF states that *“proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise”*.
- 6.78 However, prior to going into detailed sections on specific issues, the NPPF discusses how sustainable development is to be achieved. **Paragraph 14** explains that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as a *‘golden thread’* running through decision-taking. It makes clear, in circumstances where there is no extant adopted plan or relevant plan containing no applicable policies that planning permission should not be forthcoming where any adverse impacts of a development would *“significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits”* or where there are policies within the NPPF which indicate such development should be restricted.
- 6.79 **Paragraph 17** identifies the core land use planning principles that should underpin decision-taking. Within the context of this planning application, the most relevant principles include those below which state that planning should:
- *“proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver homes, businesses and industrial unity, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”* (the 3<sup>rd</sup> principle);
  - *“always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings”* (the 4<sup>th</sup> principle);
  - recognise *“the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”* (the 5<sup>th</sup> principle);
  - *“contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution”* (the 7<sup>th</sup> principle);
  - *“conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life for this and future generations”* (the 10<sup>th</sup> principle);

- focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable (the 11<sup>th</sup> principle); and,
- “take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs” (the 12<sup>th</sup> principle).

6.80 The paragraphs within the NPPF considered to be most relevant to the determination of this application include the following:

- paragraphs 18-20 (inclusive) of Section 1 (*‘building a strong, competitive economy’*);
- paragraphs 32 & 34 of Section 4 (*‘promoting sustainable transport’*);
- paragraph 69 of Section 8 (*‘promoting healthy communities’*);
- paragraphs 93, 100 & 103 of Section 10 (*‘meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change’*);
- paragraphs 109, 118, 120-123 & 125 of Section 11 (*‘conserving and enhancing the natural environment’*);
- paragraphs 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 & 139 of Section 12 (*‘conserving and enhancing the historic environment’*);
- paragraphs 142 & 144 of Section 13 (*‘facilitating the sustainable use of minerals’*); and,
- paragraphs 186 & 187, 203 & 204 of the section on *‘decision-taking’*.

6.81 For the purpose of the consideration of this specific planning application and, ultimately, arriving at an Officer recommendation in respect of the determination of this planning application, Sections

- 2 (*‘Ensuring the vitality of town centres’*);
- 5 (*‘Supporting high quality communications infrastructure’*);
- 6 (*‘Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes’*);
- 7 (*‘Requiring good design’*); and,
- 9 (*‘Protecting green belt land’*)

have all been deemed not to be sufficiently material and, therefore, receive no further attention within this report.

*‘Building a strong, competitive economy’*

6.82 Section 1 focusses upon *‘building a strong, competitive economy’*. Within its paragraphs are made statements such as “the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity” (**Paragraph 18**), the planning system should do “everything it can to support sustainable economic growth” and “significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system” (**Paragraph 19**) as well as expressing the need, in the fifth and last paragraph, to “support an economy fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (**Paragraph 20**).

6.83 This element of the NPPF is considered relevant in light of the current planning application which relies for support upon positive economic growth outcomes.

*‘Promoting sustainable transport’*

6.84 The next relevant section within the NPPF is that which relates to *‘promoting sustainable transport’* (Section 4, paragraphs 32 and 34). These direct that

decisions should take account of whether “opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site”; whether “safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved”; and, whether improvements are possible. It makes clear within **Paragraph 32** that “development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe” and **Paragraph 34** states “decisions should ensure that developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised”; although in rural areas this needs to take account of other policies in the NPPF.

- 6.85 In light of the current planning application proposing material changes in highway and traffic characteristics along affected routes, these paragraphs of the NPPF are considered relevant.

‘Promoting healthy communities’

- 6.86 **Paragraph 69**, within Section 8, states that “the planning system can play an important role in... creating healthy, inclusive communities” and that “local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of local communities” in planning decisions.

- 6.87 This element of the NPPF is considered relevant in light of the current planning application proposing a development with attendant effects in terms of, inter alia, air quality, noise, hydrology, traffic, transport and socio-economic impacts.

‘Meeting the challenges of climate change’, flooding and coastal change’

- 6.88 Paragraph 100 and Paragraph 103 of Section 10 of the NPPF relate to the avoidance of inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding. **Paragraph 100** states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding “should be avoided by directing development away from areas of highest risk”, and, in **Paragraph 103** that, in determining applications, planning authorities “should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere”. Where it can be demonstrated, within a development site, it advises that “the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk” and “development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant” and that priority is given to use of sustainable drainage systems.

- 6.89 The red line boundary of the current planning application is affected by land identified as Flood Zone by the Environment Agency as referred earlier in this report. The northern part of the site, both south and north of the River Swale is within Flood Zone 3, and is considered to form part of the functional floodplain, which is land where water has to flow or be stored. Other parts of the application site, to the east and in and around Killerby Hall, fall within Flood Zone 2. This element of the NPPF relating to flooding is consequently also considered relevant to the determination of this application.

‘Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’

- 6.90 Within paragraphs 109, 112, 118, 120-123 and 125 of Section 11, it is clear that the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or



proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account.

- 6.91 **Paragraph 109** confirms that *“the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:*
- *protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils (1<sup>st</sup> bullet point);*
  - *recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services (2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point);*
  - *minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point);*
  - *preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point); and,*
  - *remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate”.*
- 6.92 **Paragraph 112** is of relevance to this application due to the presence of agricultural land within the application site. It states that *“Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality”.*
- 6.93 **Paragraph 118** of the NPPF encourages planning authorities to consider securing measures to conserve and enhance biodiversity both within and around the development proposals they permit (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point of paragraph 118), aligning this with the duty placed on public authorities to conserve biodiversity in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat under the provisions of Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).
- 6.94 **Paragraph 120** of the NPPF states that, in order to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, *“planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account...”.*
- 6.95 Decisions should also ensure that sites for proposed development are *“suitable”* for their new uses *“taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation”* and that *“adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented”*. It clearly states that any land, once remediated, should not thereafter be determined as contaminated land (**Paragraph 121** refers).

6.96 However, **Paragraph 122** expressly makes clear that authorities should focus upon the acceptability of the use of the land which is the subject of a proposed development and the impacts resulting therefrom, “*rather than the control of processes or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes*”. Authorities must assume that “*these regimes will operate effectively*”. It follows therefore, that “*the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities*”, “*where a planning decision has been made on a particular development*”.

6.97 **Paragraph 123** states that decisions should aim to:

- *avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;*
- *mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions;*
- *recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and*
- *identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.*

[\* the term ‘*significant adverse impacts*’ and ‘*adverse*’ are explained in the ‘*Noise Policy Statement for England*’ (DeFRA, 2010) and further advice is also referenced below in the context of the national online planning practice guidance]

‘*Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*’

6.98 **Paragraph 128** of Section 12 of the NPPF requires applicants to “*describe the significance\* of any heritage assets\*\* affected, including any contribution made by their setting\*\*\*. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance...*”

[\* the NPPF defines ‘*significance*’ as “*the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting*”]

[\*\* the NPPF defines ‘*heritage asset*’ as a “*building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)*”]

[\*\*\* the NPPF defines the ‘*setting of a heritage asset*’ as “*the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral*”]

- 6.99 **Paragraph 129** requires authorities to “*identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation\* and any aspect of the proposal.* [\* the NPPF defines ‘conservation’ as “the process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance”]
- 6.100 **Paragraph 131** also requires authorities take account of “*the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets...*” (1<sup>st</sup> bullet point). While this current application does not concern an application for Listed Building Consent, it nevertheless provides the applicable test against which local planning authorities should assess proposals affecting listed buildings stating that authorities should have ‘*special regard*’ to the “*desirability of preserving [a] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*” (Section 66 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 refers).
- 6.101 **Paragraph 132** states “*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional*”. [the NPPF defines ‘designated heritage asset’ as a “*World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation*”]
- 6.102 **Paragraph 133** is concerned with a circumstance where a development proposal is deemed to give rise to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated asset which, if other criteria cannot be satisfied would warrant a refusal of planning permission; whereas, **Paragraph 134** is concerned with a circumstance where a development proposal is deemed to lead to less than substantial harm. In such an instance, this harm is required to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal put forward.
- 6.103 **Paragraph 135** requires the effect of an application upon a non-designated heritage asset’s significance to be taken into account and where applications directly, or indirectly, affect non-designated heritage assets, “*a balanced*

*judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.*

- 6.104 Where there exist non-designated assets of archaeological interest that could be regarded to be of similar significance to scheduled monuments, these should be assessed along with policies pertaining to designated heritage assets (**Paragraph 139** refers).
- 6.105 In the circumstance of this specific planning application, the presence of designated heritage assets (such as Killerby Hall immediately adjacent to the application site of which the stable element is listed) and three *Scheduled Ancient Monuments* which are also located within close proximity of the application site) requires regard to be had to paragraphs 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 139 within the NPPF. In addition, regard must also be had to the provisions of Section 66 of the [Planning \(Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#) which requires planning authorities to “*have special regard to the desirability of preserving [a] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*”.

*‘Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals’*

- 6.106 Paragraphs 142 to 149 focusses upon facilitating the sustainable use of minerals and, in its opening paragraph, states that minerals are “*essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make the best use of them to secure their long term conservation*” (**Paragraph 142**).
- 6.107 Specifically relating to decision-taking, the bullet points within **Paragraph 144** relevant to the determination of this application require planning authorities to:
- *give great weight to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy* (1<sup>st</sup> bullet point);
  - *ensure, in granting planning permission for mineral development, that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality* (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point);
  - *ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions [...] are controlled, mitigated or removed at source and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties*” (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point); and,
  - *provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary. Bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances*” (6<sup>th</sup> bullet point).
- 6.108 **Paragraph 145** states that planning authorities “*should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by: making provision for the maintenance of*

*landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials is not compromised. Longer periods may be appropriate to take account of the need to supply a range of types of aggregates, locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and productive capacity of permitted sites”.*

‘Decision-taking’

- 6.109 In taking decisions, planning authorities are asked to approach them “*in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development*” (**Paragraph 186** refers) and authorities “*should look for solutions rather than problems, and [...] should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible [...working...] proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area*” (**Paragraph 187**).
- 6.110 With regard to the imposition of planning conditions and obligations, **Paragraph 203** requires planning authorities to “*consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions [so long as they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects] or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition*”. Furthermore, planning obligations should only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind (**Paragraph 204** refers).
- 6.111 **Paragraph 205** states that “*Where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled*”.
- 6.112 **Paragraph 206** states that “*Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects*”.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- 6.113 The [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) (NPPG) was first published as an online resource on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014 and has subsequently been updated on a number of occasions and in a number of respects. It replaced a suite of previous planning circulars and guidance documents and contains advice on a variety of planning topics. The NPPG is intended to be read alongside policy expressed within the NPPF. In respect of this particular planning application, the relevant advice includes that which relates to the following:
- mitigation against the impacts of climate change (Section 6, paragraph 003 & 005);
  - risk giving rise to flooding events not previously experienced or new ones (Section 7, paragraphs 001, 029);

- visual impacts both locally and beyond and impacts upon wider landscape character (Section 8, paragraph 001);
- safeguarding of biodiversity and sites of local, national or international designation as well as possible loss of protected species and their associated habitats (Section 8, paragraphs 007 & 008, 011, 016 to 018 and 020);
- impacts upon agriculture and the quality of the land in the area in respect of ‘*best and most versatile land*’ i.e. Grade 3a and above (Section 8, paragraphs 025 & 026);
- impacts upon features of archaeological and heritage value (Section 18a, paragraph 017);
- planning obligations (Section 23b, paragraphs 001, 003 & 004);
- extraction of minerals (Section 27, paragraphs 012-014, 017, 019-022, 091-146);
- waste (Section 28, paragraphs 005 & 010);
- mitigation against noise impacts (Section 30, paragraphs 001-003, 006 & 008);
- impacts of external lighting (Section 31, paragraphs 001-004);
- impacts upon air quality including dust (Section 32, paragraphs 001, 005 & 009);
- risk of contaminating land (Section 33, paragraph 001);
- quality of water, its supply and related infrastructure as well as possible ground and/or surface water impacts (Section 34, paragraph 016);
- public rights of way (Section 37, paragraph 004);
- traffic impacts (Section 42, paragraph 004);
- land stability (Section 45); and,
- risks to community health and well-being (Section 53, paragraphs 001 & 002).

6.114 For the purpose of the consideration of this specific planning application and, ultimately, arriving at an Officer recommendation in respect of the determination of this planning application (other than Section 4 (*‘Environmental Impact Assessment’*), Section 13 (*‘When is permission required?’*), Section 14 which covers making an application, Section 15 covering consultation and pre-decision matters, Section 21a covering the use of planning conditions and Section 21b covering the processes involved in determining planning applications), the Sections of the NPPG listed below have not been considered sufficiently material and have, therefore, received no further attention within this report:

- 2a (Housing and economic needs assessments);
- 2b (Ensuring the vitality of town centres);
- 3 (Housing and economic land availability assessment);
- 5 (Renewable and low carbon energy);
- 9 (Duty to Cooperate);
- 10 (Viability);
- 11 (Strategic Environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal);
- 12 (Local Plans);

- 16 (Appeals);
- 17a (Flexible options for planning permissions);
- 17b (Ensuring effective enforcement);
- 17c (Lawful Development Certificates);
- 18b (Advertisements);
- 20 (Before submitting a planning application);
- 22 (Fees for planning applications);
- 25 (Community Infrastructure Levy);
- 26 (Design);
- 36 (Tree Preservation Orders and trees in Conservation Areas);
- 39 (Hazardous substances);
- 41 (Neighbourhood Planning);
- 44 (Crown Development);
- 50 (Rural Housing);
- 54 (Transport evidence bases in plan making and decision taking);
- 55 (Starter Homes);
- 56 (Housing – Optional Technical Standards); and,
- 57 (Self-build and custom housebuilding).

‘Climate change’

6.115 This section of the online guidance (Section 6) “*advises how planning can identify suitable mitigation and adaptation measures [...] to address the potential impacts of climate change*” and aligns with and supports policy expressed within Paragraph 93 of Section 10 of the NPPF.

6.116 **Paragraph 003** within the NPPG cites the consideration of the “*availability of water and water infrastructure for the lifetime of the development and design responses to promote water efficiency and protect water quality*” as an example of the planning system’s means of adapting to a changing climate whilst at the same time being “*realistic*” such as looking at the “*the potential vulnerability of a development to climate change risk over its whole lifetime*” (**Paragraph 005** refers).

‘Flood risk and coastal change’

6.117 This section of the online guidance (Section 7) “*advises on how planning can take account of the risks associated with flooding and coastal change in plan-making and the application process*”. Planning Authorities are advised to adopt a sequential approach when determining applications. In terms of minerals development, the NPPG states that “*mineral workings can be large and may afford opportunities for applying the sequential approach at the site level. It may be possible to locate ancillary facilities such as processing plant and offices in areas at lowest flood risk. Sequential working and restoration can be designed to reduce flood risk by providing flood storage and attenuation. This is likely to be most effective at a strategic (county) scale*”.

6.118 **Paragraph 001** advises where development needs to be in locations where there is a risk of flooding that “*development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, safe for its users for the development’s lifetime, and will not increase flood risk overall*”. Furthermore, flood risk to and from the development site

needs to be considered and flood risk should also be assessed, avoided, managed and/or mitigated (**Paragraph 029** refers).

- 6.119 These paragraphs align with and support policy expressed within Paragraphs 100 and 103 of Section 10 of the NPPF.

'Natural environment'

- 6.120 Part 1 of Section 8 focusses upon 'landscape', Part 2 upon 'Biodiversity and ecosystems' and Part 4 upon 'brownfield land, soils and agricultural land' under the umbrella theme of the 'natural environment' and the relevant text contained therein includes, inter alia, **Paragraph 001** on 'landscape', **Paragraphs 007 & 008, 011, 016-018** and **020** which relate to 'bio-diversity and ecosystems' as a sub-theme and **Paragraphs 025 & 026** relating to agricultural land.

'Landscape' (Part 1)

- 6.121 **Paragraph 001** reiterates that which is contained within national policy expressed within paragraph 109 of the NPPF; that is to say, that "*planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*". The NPPG also identifies that Landscape Character Areas complement Natural England's National Character Areas, and are "*a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place*".

'Biodiversity and ecosystems' (Part 2)

- 6.122 **Paragraph 007** addresses the question of '*is there a statutory basis for planning to seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible?*' and provides a definitive answer explaining the statutory responsibilities of planning authorities in determining applications and, at its core, a duty to "*contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution*".

- 6.123 **Paragraph 008** which poses the question '*how should local planning authorities set about planning for biodiversity and geodiversity?*' requires planning authorities to "*consider the opportunities that individual development proposals may provide to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity in the wider area*".

- 6.124 In the absence of any updated guidance produced by the Government department, DeFRA, as indicated on online planning practice guidance last updated on 12th June 2014, **Paragraph 011** signposts the authorities to '*Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and geological conservation*' (published 16<sup>th</sup> August 2005) with regard to the matter of legal obligations concerning internationally designated sites; which, in summary, obliges the Authority to consider the likelihood of significant effects upon the conservation objectives of relevant sites prior to their decision-taking.

- 6.125 **Paragraph 016** advises on the question of '*how should biodiversity be taken into account in preparing a planning application?*' stating that where clearly justified, for example, where "*there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by development*", then ecological surveys



may be warranted and such surveys “*should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity*”. It goes on to advise that “*planning conditions, legal agreements or undertakings may be appropriate in order to provide for monitoring and/or biodiversity management plans where these are needed*”.

6.126 **Paragraph 017** seeks to encourage bio-diversity enhancement through planning decisions and the subsequent paragraph (**Paragraph 018**) explains the ‘*mitigation hierarchy*’ of information, avoidance, mitigation and compensation to facilitate decision-taking.

6.127 **Paragraph 020** requires the securing of mitigation and/or compensation measures such as off-setting, in instances where “*significant harm to biodiversity is unavoidable*”.

6.128 These paragraphs within the online guidance support the implementation of national policy expressed within Paragraphs 109 and 118 of the NPPF.

‘Agricultural land’ (Part 4)

6.129 **Paragraph 025** reiterates that which is set down as policy within Paragraph 109 of the NPPF; that is to say, that the “*planning system should protect and enhance valued soils and prevent the adverse effects of unacceptable levels of pollution*” by dint of the fact that soils are “*an essential finite resource*”.

6.130 Similarly, **Paragraph 026** reiterates the NPPF’s stated policy (Paragraph 112 refers) by expecting planning authorities “*to take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land [...and...] should seek to use poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality*”.

‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’

6.131 Section 18a contains **Paragraph 017** which addresses the question of “*how to assess if there is substantial harm?*” This asserts that “*significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm [is a matter of] judgment ... In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases*”.

6.132 This supports the national policy expressed within paragraphs 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 139 within the NPPF.

‘Planning obligations’

6.133 **Paragraph 001** of Section 23b states that planning obligations “*assist in mitigating the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if they meet the tests*”. These tests are that obligations are:

- necessary to make the development acceptable;
- directly related to the development; and,
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

6.134 **Paragraph 003** continues stating, inter alia, that planning obligations “assist in mitigating the impact of development which benefits local communities”. However, **Paragraph 004**, however, makes clear that planning obligations “must be fully justified and evidenced”.

6.135 These paragraphs align with and support national policy expressed within the NPPF at paragraphs 203 and 204.

‘Minerals’

6.136 This section of the NPPG, Section 27, provides “guidance on the planning for mineral extraction”.

6.137 **Paragraph 012** sets out the relationship between planning and other regulatory regimes reflecting national policy expressed within Paragraph 122 of the NPPF and also noting that “the planning system controls development and the use of land in the public interest” including ensuring development is appropriate for its location and an acceptable use of land. The guidance reiterates the NPPF’s stated approach advising that “the focus of the planning system should be on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land and the impacts of those uses, rather than any control processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under regimes. Mineral planning authorities should assume that these non-planning regimes will operate effectively.”

6.138 **Paragraph 013** sets out the environmental issues that authorities should address when dealing with applications for mineral-related development including noise, air quality, lighting, visual impact, traffic, risk of contamination to land, geological structure, flood risk, impacts on protected landscapes, surface and, in some cases, ground water issues, and water abstraction.

6.139 **Paragraph 014** sets out issues which are for other regulatory regimes to address, including, for example, ground and surface water and mining waste permits, for which the Environment Agency is responsible.

6.140 **Paragraph 017** notes that the cumulative impact of mineral development can be a material consideration in determining planning applications.

6.141 **Paragraph 019** addresses how noise should be controlled and states, “Those making mineral development proposals [...] should carry out a noise impact assessment, which should identify all sources of noise and, for each source, take account of the noise emission, its characteristics, the proposed operating locations, procedures, schedules and duration of work for the life of the operation, and its likely impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

*Proposals for the control or mitigation of noise emissions should:*

- consider the main characteristics of the production process and its environs, including the location of noise-sensitive properties and sensitive environmental sites;
- assess the existing acoustic environment around the site of the proposed operations, including background noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive properties;

- estimate the likely future noise from the development and its impact on the neighbourhood of the proposed operations;
- identify proposals to minimise, mitigate or remove noise emissions at source;
- monitor the resulting noise to check compliance with any proposed or imposed conditions.

6.142 **Paragraph 020** addresses how noise impact should be determined and states, “Mineral planning authorities should take account of the prevailing acoustic environment and in doing so consider whether or not noise from the proposed operations would:

- give rise to a significant adverse effect;
- give rise to an adverse effect; and
- enable a good standard of amenity to be achieved.

... this would include identifying whether the overall effect of the noise exposure would be above or below the significant observed adverse effect level and the lowest observed adverse effect level for the given situation...”

6.143 **Paragraph 021** enquires as to the appropriate noise standards for mineral operators for normal operations and states,

“Mineral planning authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level\* ( $L_{A90,1h}$ )\*\* by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900). Where it will be difficult not to exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A) without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator, the limit set should be as near that level as practicable. In any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  (free field)\*\*\*. For operations during the evening (1900-2200) the noise limits should not exceed the background noise level ( $L_{A90,1h}$ ) by more than 10dB(A) and should not exceed 55dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  (free field). For any operations during the period 22.00 – 07.00 noise limits should be set to reduce to a minimum any adverse impacts, without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator. In any event the noise limit should not exceed 42dB(A)  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  (free field) at a noise sensitive property.

Where the site noise has a significant tonal element, it may be appropriate to set specific limits to control this aspect. Peak or impulsive noise, which may include some reversing beepers, may also require separate limits that are independent of background noise (e.g.  $L_{max}$  \*\*\*\* in specific octave or third-octave frequency bands – and that should not be allowed to occur regularly at night.)

Care should be taken, however, to avoid any of these suggested values being implemented as fixed thresholds as specific circumstances may justify some small variation being allowed.

[\*Background noise level is defined as “the A-weighted sound pressure level of the residual noise at the assessment with no operation occurring at the proposed site, defined in terms of the  $L_{A90,T}$ ”]

[\*\* $L_{A90,1h}$  is defined as “the “A weighted” noise level exceeded for 90 per cent of the specified measurement period” (in this case 1 hour)]

[\*\*\* $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  is defined as “the “A weighted” equivalent continuous sound level – the sound level of a notionally steady sound having the same energy as the actual fluctuating sound over the same time period” (in this case 1 hour)]

[\*\*\*\* $L_{max}$  is defined as “the highest noise level recorded during a noise event or measuring period”. The time weighting should be stated]

- 6.144 **Paragraph 022** poses two questions i.e. “what type of operations may give rise to particularly noisy short-term activities?” and “what noise limits may be appropriate?” In answering these, it advises, “Activities such as soil-stripping, the construction and removal of baffle mounds, soil storage mounds and spoil heaps, construction of new permanent landforms and aspects of site road construction and maintenance. Increased temporary daytime noise limits of up to 70dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  (free field) for periods of up to eight weeks in a year at specified noise-sensitive properties should be considered to facilitate essential site preparation and restoration work and construction of baffle mounds where it is clear that this will bring longer-term environmental benefits to the site or its environs. Where work is likely to take longer than eight weeks, a lower limit over a longer period should be considered. In some wholly exceptional cases, where there is no viable alternative, a higher limit for a very limited period may be appropriate in order to attain the environmental benefits. Within this framework, the 70 dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  (free field) limit referred to above should be regarded as the normal maximum”.

- 6.145 The NPPG paragraphs, 013, 014, 017, 019-022 both align with and also support policy expressed within Paragraph 144 of the NPPF.

‘Air quality’

- 6.146 This section of the guidance on air quality (Section 32) provides “guiding principles on how planning can take account of the impact of new development on air quality” and explains within **Paragraph 001** when referring to why planning should be concerned about air quality that “action to manage and improve air quality is largely driven by EU legislation. The 2008 Ambient Air Quality Directive [...] sets legally binding limits for concentrations in outdoor air of major air pollutants that impact public health such as particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). As well as having direct effects, these pollutants can combine in the atmosphere to form ozone, a harmful air pollutant (and potent greenhouse gas) which can be transported great distances by weather systems”.
- 6.147 The NPPG confirms that planning should take air quality impacts from new development into account “where the national assessment indicates that relevant limits have been exceeded or are near the limit”. The national assessment is identified as the annual assessment undertaken by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) using monitoring and modelling information.
- 6.148 It identifies that air quality could be a relevant material consideration where: “the development is likely to generate air quality impact in an area where air quality is known to be poor...where the development is likely to impact upon the

*implementation of air quality strategies and action plans and/or...lead to a breach of EU legislation*". Furthermore, the section also notes that when deciding whether air quality is relevant to a planning application, considerations could include (in summary) whether the development would: significantly affect traffic (through congestion, volumes, speed, or traffic composition on local roads); introduce new point sources of air pollution; give rise to potentially unacceptable impact (such as dust) during construction; or affect biodiversity (**Paragraph 005** refers).

6.149 If air quality could potentially be a concern, the NPPG advises that Planning Authorities may want to consider:

- *'baseline' local air quality;*
- *whether the proposed development could significantly change air quality...; and/or*
- *whether there is likely to be an increase in the number of people exposed to a problem with air quality...".*

6.150 **Paragraph 009** explains, through the means of a flowchart, the considerations in respect of air quality in dealing with proposals. Possible options for mitigation are likely to be "*locationally specific*", "*proportionate to the likely impact*" and are capable of being secured through appropriate conditions or obligations. Examples of mitigation could include amendments to a site's layout to increase distances between pollution sources and receptors; control of emissions and dust during both construction and operation; and the provision of funding to offset any air quality impacts.

*'Water supply, waste water and water quality'*

6.151 **Paragraph 016** (Section 34), in posing the question of when water is likely to be a material consideration, advises "*this will depend on the proposed development, its location and whether there could be concerns about water supply, water quality or both*".

6.152 With respect to water quality **Paragraph 016** goes on to state that water quality "*is only likely to be a significant planning concern when a proposal would:*

- *involve physical modifications to a water body such as flood storage areas, channel diversions and dredging, removing natural barriers, construction of new locks, new culverts, major bridges, new barrages/dams, new weirs (including for hydropower) and removal of existing weirs; and/or,*
- *indirectly affect water bodies, for example,*
  - *as a result of new development such as the redevelopment of land that may be affected by contamination, mineral workings, water or wastewater treatment, waste management facilities and transport schemes including culverts and bridges;*
  - *through a lack of adequate infrastructure to deal with wastewater.*

6.153 When assessing the impacts upon water quality, they could include:

- *the likely impacts of the proposed development (including physical modifications) on water quantity and flow, river continuity and groundwater connectivity, and biological elements (flora and fauna).*

- *how the proposed development will affect measures in the river basin management plan to achieve good status in water bodies.*
- *how it is intended the development will comply with other relevant regulatory requirements relating to the water environment (such as those relating to bathing waters, shellfish waters, freshwater fish and drinking water) bearing in mind compliance will be secured through the Environment Agency's permitting responsibilities.*

6.154 Paragraph 016 of the online guidance aligns with and provides support to Paragraphs 109 and 120 of the NPPF.

*'Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space'*

6.155 **Paragraph 004** of Part 2 of Section 37 to the NPPG signposts planning authorities to Rights of Way Circular (1/09) published by DEFRA in October 2009 which states that the *"effect of development on a public right of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission and local planning authorities should ensure that the potential consequences are taken into account whenever such applications are considered."* Similarly, in respect of the requirements upon developers, it states *"the information supplied by an applicant should therefore make clear how the potential development will impinge on any rights of way"*.

*'Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking'*

6.156 **Paragraph 004** of Section 42 of the NPPG explains that transport assessments are *"ways of assessing the potential transport impacts of developments"*.

*'Land stability'*

6.157 Section 45 of the NPPG places an expectation that authorities will take into account and consider land stability issues, especially within areas of known landslides, mining hazards or subsidence and ensuring against development where instability exists. Evidence available to the County Planning Authority does not suggest that the area within which the application is situated is vulnerable to either landslides, mining hazards or subsidence.

*'Health and wellbeing'*

6.158 **Paragraph 001** of Section 53 of the NPPG enquires of the role of health and wellbeing in planning and states that planning authorities *"should ensure that health and wellbeing, and health infrastructure are considered [...] in planning decision making"* in line with policy expressed within Paragraph 69 of the NPPF. **Paragraph 002** declares the built and natural environments to be *"major determinants of health and wellbeing"* and goes on to list, amongst others, that planning authorities should, in considering new development proposals, ensure *"potential pollution and other environmental hazards, which might lead to an adverse impact on human health, are accounted for"*. Planning authorities are advised to consider consulting relevant Directors of Public Health.

6.159 These paragraphs within the national guidance link to Paragraph 69 of the NPPF as earlier described.

Other Material Considerations: Draft North Yorkshire, York and North York Moors National Park Authority Minerals and Waste Joint Plan

- 6.160 Members will be aware that the County Council is currently working towards the adoption of a Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan together with the City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority. When adopted the new policies in the Joint Plan will replace existing 'saved' policies in the Council's Minerals and Waste Local Plans. The current timetable for preparation of the Joint Plan indicates that adoption is anticipated this year.
- 6.161 As the Plan has progressed, a significant amount of public and other stakeholder engagement has taken place during consultation and a corresponding significant consideration of the implications of views expressed. It is acknowledged that there is the potential for the detail of the draft policies to be subject to varying degrees of change before the Plan is complete. The possible extent of that change will only become clearer as the Plan makes further progress. Notwithstanding, the Plan progressing through to adoption, is nevertheless material to the determination of this application before Members.
- 6.162 **Paragraph 216** within Annex 1 to the NPPF states that decision takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:
- *the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
  - *the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and,*
  - *the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*
- 6.163 While the new policies within the emerging plan are potentially material to the consideration of the current planning application, it is considered that they should be given only limited weight at this stage with the scrutiny at *Examination in Public* by an Inspector appointed on behalf of the Secretary of State yet to take place. At this point in time, it must also be taken into account that there are significant unresolved objections to relevant draft policies.
- 6.164 The emerging plan aims to find further resources for sand and gravel and divides North Yorkshire up into 'northern' and 'southern' distribution areas. To this extent it maintains the approach set out in the [Minerals Local Plan 1997](#) 'saved' policies. The application site falls within the 'northern distribution area', and the emerging plan considers that this area will account for half of the future supply of sand and gravel in the area. More specifically, the application site has also been proposed as a *Preferred Option*, "in order to meet requirements during the plan period" of sand and gravel.

## **7.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 As earlier referred, the provisions of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require the 'starting point' in the determination

of planning applications to be the *Development Plan*. All planning authorities must determine each planning application in accordance with the planning policies that comprise the *Development Plan* unless there exist material considerations, including any impacts upon interests of acknowledged importance, indicating that planning permission should not be forthcoming. Therefore, the assessment of the overall planning balance is conveyed here within this section of the report.

- 7.2 In this particular instance of this application, there are a range of planning policies within the documents that form *the Development Plan* (Section 6.0 above refers) that need to be taken into account, as well as a number of other material considerations.
- 7.3 In considering the relationship of the proposals to the *Development Plan*, Members are advised to note that proposals should be judged against the *Development Plan* as a whole rather than against individual policies in isolation. Members are also advised to bear in mind the relative weight to be attached to the applicable policies in the various elements of the *Development Plan* relevant to this proposal against that which is laid down within national planning policy (Section 6.0 again refers).
- 7.4 The analysis that follows, therefore, assesses the proposed development against the extant planning policies contained within the Development Plan. Section 6.0 of this report refers to those policies that are considered most relevant to the determination of the planning application. This assessment will establish the acceptability, or otherwise, of the proposal against those policies to establish whether '*in principle*' the development either is, or is not, acceptable by virtue of degree of compliance and/or conflict with policies contained within each of the relevant Development Plan documents. It should be noted that it does not follow that where a proposal conflicts/complies with just one policy that a proposal must be deemed unacceptable/acceptable, but it is a question of the degree of conflict/ compliance and the weight apportioned in that circumstance that gives rise to the final analysis.
- 7.5 Within the paragraphs that follow this '*in principle*' position, lies the analysis of the proposal in respect of the effects of the proposed development upon various interests of acknowledged importance and the establishment of whether there exist any '*other material considerations*' that would outweigh/override the earlier referred '*in principle*' position.
- 7.6 The NPPF also confirms that local plan policies whilst they might be ones pre-dating the publication of the NPPF in 2012, they should not be considered out-of-date simply because of their age. This is particularly relevant within the applicable and extant planning policy context within which this particular application must be considered. The NPPF states that "*due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of*



*consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)”.*

- 7.7 The North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (NYMLP) was adopted in 1997 under legislation pre-dating the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (but with certain policies ‘saved’ by Direction of the Secretary of State in 2007. Weight should therefore be attached to the policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (Section 6.0 above refers).

*The principle of the proposed development*

- 7.8 Amongst the aims of the NYMLP are those ensuring the adequate and steady supply of minerals, preventing the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources and sustaining the contribution of mineral-related employment to the rural economy whilst simultaneously ensuring the sustainable use of resources in a way which protects the local environment, both natural and historic as well as safeguarding the amenities of those living and working in local communities. The NPPF recognises minerals are a finite natural resource and can only be worked where they are found. It is, therefore, important to make the best use of them as a means to secure their long-term conservation (NPPF’s Paragraph 142 refers). Inherent in the applicant’s assessment of the likely significant effects of the proposed development is the question of whether the proposed development could take place elsewhere other than the chosen location of the planning application. A part of the applicant’s environmental impact assessment into alternative locations for the proposed development, the applicant company’s Environmental Statement explains the choice of the application site has been determined on the basis of geology of the area, the availability of the land to be worked and ease of operational access. The proposed application site meets these considerations insofar as the site has known sand and gravel deposits and is available. A further consideration is the avoidance of sterilisation of the remaining reserves within the proximate former Ellerton Quarry workings north of the River Swale.
- 7.9 The aims of the NYMLP are consistent with the NPPF which sets out policy on the importance of minerals and mineral extraction as being “*essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life*” and emphasises the importance of ensuring a sufficient supply of mineral materials is available to the construction industry to provide the infrastructure and buildings that are needed by the country (Section 6.0 above refers). It states that great weight should be given to the benefits of minerals extraction (Paragraph 144 refers). It goes on to state in Paragraph 145 that it requires authorities to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates which will contribute to the overall national need. In regard to the provision of sand and gravel, the NPPF states authorities should make provision for the maintenance of a landbank of *at least* 7 years within their areas.

- 7.10 At the time of the original submission of the proposals for the Killerby site, the landbank (the key indicator of the adequate levels of reserves), monitored by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Aggregates Working Party (YHRAWP) calculated the sub-regional apportionment for North Yorkshire to equate to an extraction rate of 2.63 million tonnes per annum. The ES (July 2010) made reference to the County Planning Authority's Annual Report and Aggregates Monitoring Report for 2008 (published in October 2009) by YHRAWP, which the applicant company stated, identified that, as of the end of 2008, the permitted reserves of sand and gravel in the county were 20.02 million tonnes, equivalent to an overall landbank supply of 7.6 years. This was sub-divided into three subdivisions by the YHRAWP, which entailed three sites with a "*predominately northern distribution suitable for the production of concrete, sites with a predominately southern distribution suitable for the production of concrete and sites with reserves of mostly soft sand*". The applicant company maintains the proposed development falls within the first sub-division as it has a "*predominately northern distribution suitable for the production of concrete*" ('saved' Policy 5/1 of the NYMLP refers).
- 7.11 However, in the intervening time period, the most recent data (YHAWP) for sand and gravel production up to the period ending December 2015 identifies land bank reserves of sand and gravel across the county to be equivalent to 10.3 years; while this information does not provide a specific landbank figure for this 'northwards distribution area', the [Local Aggregates Assessment](#) (LAA) for North Yorkshire, approved by the YHAWP in September 2016, indicates a landbank to have reduced to 5.6 years by the end of 2015.
- 7.12 While at the time of the submission of the planning application, the landbank had been above the minimum 7 year period (at 10.05 years according to the *Aggregates Monitoring Report* (AMR) (2008)), the intervening years since the application's submission has seen a consistent depletion in reserves meaning that the landbank is now below the 7 year minimum. The national policy requirement is to maintain a landbank of at least 7 years. As expected, in the absence of further reserves coming '*on-stream*', the landbank has fallen below the required minimum level during the last five to six years. Furthermore, there no longer remain any '*Preferred Areas*' for sand and gravel working arising from the adopted NYMLP; having all been subject to consent and either have contributed or continuing to contribute toward the current landbank. There are, therefore, no remaining available '*Preferred Areas*' in the NYMLP that can be brought forward to either sustain or bring the level of the sand and gravel landbank above the 7 year minimum. The County Planning Authority's Monitoring Report (2014/2015) noted that in order to maintain the landbank level above the required 7 years in the future, there is the need for new reserves of sand and gravel to be developed "*if environmentally suitable locations can be identified, by extending existing quarry sites and/or opening new quarries*". It consequently follows that, in order to '*lift*' the landbank prior to the adoption of the new Local Plan, permission would need to be granted

on sites not currently allocated in the *Development Plan*. This would align and be consistent with national policy expressed within Paragraph 145 of the NPPF.

- 7.13 The applicant's estimated mineral reserve of the current proposal for the Killerby site at 11.37 million tonnes of sand and gravel points to the ability of this proposal to make a significant contribution toward the county's depleted '*northern distribution area*' landbank. The Environmental Statement accompanying the application explains that the mineral deposit at Killerby has been explored by rotary auger drilling undertaken between 1960 and 2009 and a total of 220 boreholes have been drilled across the site. The [borehole log data](#) that has been submitted in support of the application and has informed its submission has also been accompanied by data from 16 trial pits and cross references have been made with the three British Geological Survey boreholes. The proposed development in the view of the applicant company offers the opportunity to secure future sand and gravel supply for the local building market and enabling the exploitation of what remains of the reserve in the former Ellerton Quarry workings by the use of conveyors and the siting of processing plant within the proposed Killerby site.
- 7.14 The applicant company's Environmental Statement explains that the proposed development is required as a "*direct replacement for Ellerton and Scorton Quarries and would allow for the uninterrupted and continued supply of sand and gravel to the existing established market*". It maintains that without the security of the supply offered by the proposed Killerby quarry, the applicant company would not be in a position to guarantee long-term supply to the "*existing established market*" and that if permission were to be obtained for the Killerby site then with the Scorton site fully exploited, the applicant company could relocate processing plant enabling the processing of mineral within the unworked phases of former Ellerton Quarry removing any requirement for processing at Ellerton Quarry (as per its original permission ref: C1/21/28/PA dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1994) and allowing the processing of mineral at a single site. This could potentially have the advantage of removing heavy vehicular traffic from the local road network around Brompton-on-Swale and Scorton.
- 7.15 The reasoned arguments put forward point to the proposals having the potential to sustain a continuity of supply of sand and gravel for the local construction market without the need for increased pressure being applied on other existing sand and gravel sites as well as assisting the county in maintaining its landbank for a period in excess of twenty years.
- 7.16 The NYMLP '*saved*' policies set out an approach to the consideration of applications for new aggregate mineral working. '*Saved*' policies 3/2, 3/3 and 3/4 of the NYMLP provide the current *Development Plan* '*framework*' for the consideration of planning applications for new mineral sites and extensions to existing quarries. The NYMLP identifies '*Preferred Areas*' and '*Areas of Search*'. '*Saved*' Policy 3/2 directs that '*in order to maintain landbanks of*

*permitted reserves, proposals for aggregates mineral working in Preferred Areas will be regarded as acceptable in principle*. However, as earlier referred, there are no 'Preferred Area' allocations remaining in regard to those sites identified in the current NYMLP and the site currently under consideration is not designated as a 'Preferred Area'. For the purpose of considering the current application, this falls outside the requirement set out in 'saved' Policy 3/2 for the reason given. Notwithstanding this absence of 'preferred area' status, the majority of the application site (with the exception of an element of Phase 2 and all of sub-phase 1C) is identified within the south of Catterick 'Area of Search'. 'Saved' Policy 3/3 of the NYMLP indicates that permission may be granted for aggregate mineral working within 'Areas of Search' where the County Planning Authority is satisfied that sufficient mineral cannot be obtained from 'Preferred Areas'. It is considered that the requirements of 'saved' Policy 3/2 and 3/3 are broadly consistent with Paragraphs 144 and 145 of the NPPF that respectively both "give great weight to the benefits of the mineral extraction, including the economy" and provide "for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by making provision for the maintenance of landbanks for at least 7 years for sand and gravel".

7.17 The proposal is not considered to conflict with the primary purposes of either 'saved' Policy 3/2 or 'saved' Policy 3/3 and a decision in favour of granting planning permission in this particular circumstance is considered to be consistent with Paragraph 145 of the NPPF in seeking to maintain landbanks of permitted sand and gravel reserves of at least 7 years. Therefore, taking into consideration the exhaustion of 'preferred sites' within the county, the application site, sequentially, is considered appropriate and therefore the principle of this site is acceptable in order to help ensure continuity of supply. Whilst only limited weight may be given to the emerging Plan, it is important to note that the Plan proposes the application site as a 'preferred allocation' to meet sand and gravel requirements during the plan period. The proposal introduces 'new reserves' which ought to be given due consideration. A refusal of planning permission could potentially lead to increased pressure at other sand and gravel sites within the 'northwards distribution area' and would prejudice the county's ability to reach and subsequently maintain an adequate landbank in the near term. Furthermore, it is not possible to predict future production capacity levels at any of the other sites with confidence and, therefore, there can be no certainty any shortfall can be made up from these other sand and gravel quarries.

7.18 It must also be borne in mind that, although a smaller area in spatial terms, an element of the Killerby proposals comprises land that falls outwith any 'preferred area' or even 'area of search' and therefore 'saved' Policy 3/4 of the NYMLP which concerns itself with the circumstance of sites brought forward outwith both 'preferred areas' and 'areas of search', is considered to be engaged in this particular instance. Although this proposed development would not constitute an extension to an existing working quarry *per se*, it is

important to note that Phase 1 of the proposal would be used for the processing of sand and gravel extracted from the neighbouring former Ellerton Quarry and would ensure the exploitation of a known and available mineral reserves that exist within the former workings. The proposed Killerby site, when assessed against 'saved' Policy 3/4 of the NYMLP, can be considered to be consistent with the objective of this policy in that it would safeguard against the possible sterilisation of mineral resources.

- 7.19 A decision granting permission for the proposal would, it is considered, be consistent with Paragraph 144 and Paragraph 145 of the NPPF that require authorities to give *'great weight to the benefits of mineral extraction, including the economy'* and *'plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by making provision for the maintenance of landbanks for at least 7 years for sand and gravel'*.
- 7.20 Before bringing to a close the consideration of the acceptability of the development *'in principle'*, due regard must also be had to the policy relating to both the siting and scale of a proposed minerals-related development; the acceptability of which is sought by criterion (b) of NYMLP 'saved' Policy 4/1. In terms of siting, as earlier referred, the site of the proposed development has been the subject of a [Geological Investigation](#) explaining that over the last forty years, the site has been the focus of over 200 boreholes and trial pits. The submission of this information (including the borehole logs submitted with the original application documentation), together with the further information submitted during the processing of this application, is considered to be both adequate and satisfactory in order to determine the proposal's acceptability in respect of this specific consideration. In terms of scale, the proposal comprises a circa 213 hectares (ha) site, with an extraction area of 114ha, producing approximately 11.37 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a 17.5 year period, with a production rate of 650,000 tonnes per annum from the application site (excluding the material that will be processed from Ellerton Quarry). It is acknowledged that the proposed development introduces a large-scale quarry site within the landscape. However, with appropriate mitigation measures in place to assist in visually screening the development during its operational phase, the scale of development is considered acceptable and should be considered against its temporary nature and that it would assist the County Planning Authority's role in securing a long-term supply of sand and gravel in the county.
- 7.21 A new sand and gravel working at Killerby Quarry could play a significant role in the supply of sand and gravel in the county contributing to sustained resources for growth. The proposed development would secure productive capacity, ensuring continuity of supply from the county and assisting in maintaining a sufficient land bank reserve of sand and gravel. Were planning permission to be forthcoming, it would constitute an efficient use of mineral resources permitting the recovery of known reserves of sand and gravel within

the former Ellerton Quarry workings by means of infrastructure (i.e. river crossings) and the use of a single site for the purpose of processing. Another potential benefit arising would be the safeguarding against sterilisation of mineral reserves that remain. To this end, whilst normally a period of three years in which to implement a permission is common place, in this particular instance, taking into account the associated workings and proposed sequence of extraction, an additional three year period in which to implement is considered to be reasonable.

7.22 In summary, significant material considerations are, therefore, the absence of up-to-date allocations, the benefits of safeguarding against mineral sterilisation and the need to help support the landbank level which collectively lend policy support to the '*in principle*' acceptability of the proposed development and do not render the proposed development in significant material conflict with spatial distribution-related/locational policies of the NYMLP; nor is it rendered in significant material conflict with the general aims of NPPF's Paragraph 17 (encouraging economic development, amongst others, through the delivery of infrastructure and sustaining jobs and contributing to economic wealth) and the overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF as well as the more relevant policies of the NPPF i.e. paragraphs 142, 144 and 145; nor is there considered to be any significant conflict to any material degree with Policy CP3 and CP13 (supporting development which respects and enhances "*local context and its special qualities, including its design features, landscape, social activities, historic environment and nationally and locally recognised designation*") of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policy CP1 and CP17 (which similar to that of RDC's CS Policy CP13 seeks development to "*respect and enhance the local context and its special qualities, including its urban design, landscape, social activities and historic environment*") of the Hambleton Core Strategy, with criterion (b) of NYMLP 'saved' Policy 4/1, or with 'saved' Policies 3/3, 3/4 and 5/1 of the NYMLP. It is therefore considered that, subject to the identified reserves being capable of being extracted without unacceptable harm to interests of acknowledged importance, the principle of granting planning permission for this development, is considered to be acceptable, for the reasons thus far explained.

7.23 However, the issue of whether any other material considerations are materially significant so as to find the development proposed in this particular instance unacceptable in land-use planning terms and, thereby, indicating a view contrary to the above '*in principle*' acceptability of the proposed development must be addressed and is discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Assessment of the proposal against other material considerations

7.24 The assessment that follows comprises those matters that are regarded as the principal effects of the proposed development and aligns with the assessed likely significant effects within the scope of the environmental impact

assessment (EIA) undertaken to support the application; although the order in which they appear below is, by no means, an indication of their importance relative to one another. They comprise effects upon interests of acknowledged importance including those upon both the environment (flora and fauna) and local communities:

- [vibration, noise and air quality impacts](#);
- [landscape and visual impacts](#);
- [nature conservation, ecology and habitat protection](#);
- [cultural heritage and archaeological impacts](#);
- [transport and traffic impacts](#);
- [hydrological and hydrogeological impacts](#);
- [access and recreation](#);
- [impacts upon soil management and agricultural land](#);
- [restoration and 'after-care'](#);
- [socio-economic impacts](#); and,
- [cumulative impacts](#).

Vibration, noise and air quality impacts

7.25 It is recognised that mineral workings and associated activities have the potential to have considerable environmental impacts, to varying degrees depending upon the mineral proposed to be worked, but nevertheless, most notably those of vibration, noise and dust. The potential environmental effects of the proposed quarry at Killerby from a vibration, noise and air quality perspective which could potentially impact upon the amenity currently enjoyed by local residents in the vicinity of the application site have been subject to environmental impact assessment (EIA) and the methodology, evidence, findings and recommendations have been brought together within the submitted Environmental Statement (updated and revised).

Vibration

7.26 The assessment of the effects of the proposed development in respect of vibration has been explained within the Environmental Statement (Chapter 11 refers) which accompanies the planning application. It explains that taking into consideration that the “*highest levels of vibration from surface mineral workings are generally only associated with blasting*”, only a limited assessment of potential effects from vibration has been considered necessary by the applicant company in relation to this particular proposed development. This remained the consistent opinion upon the review of the development proposals in submissions made in February 2016, as there continues to be no blasting operations proposed.

7.27 However, the potential for effects from vibration from associated plant and machinery has been assessed and that assessment has concluded that, given the separation distance between such operations and those living nearby, any potential impact has been considered to be insignificant and would not constitute a significant adverse effect of the proposed development. There

have been no objections returned during the course of processing and consulting upon this application with regards to the issue of vibration either from statutory consultees or other interested parties; thereby rendering this specific effect of the proposed development being mitigated to such a degree as to not warrant a reason to arrive at a view contrary to the *'in principle'* acceptability of the proposed development.

### Noise

- 7.28 With regards to the assessment of any potential significant adverse effects of the proposed development as a result of noise generated by activities associated with the proposed development, the Environmental Statement has confirmed that baseline noise surveys have been carried out in the area around the application site and that such measurements have confirmed that *"the site location [to be] dominated by traffic noise from the A1 and [therefore] appropriate noise criteria have been recommended"*.
- 7.29 The assessment has considered the potential noise impacts of the proposed development during temporary operations, e.g. soil stripping, and the long-term day operations upon a number of properties located close to the application site<sup>15</sup>.
- 7.30 The noise chapter of the Environmental Statement accompanying the application also has explained that when assessing the shorter term potential impacts of the operations, then a higher noise limit of up to 70dB  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  is supported in national policy as being used as the threshold. Whilst acknowledging the impact of these temporary operations to be *'adverse'*, they have equally been acknowledged as being both *'short-term'* and *'reversible'* in their nature; thereby resulting in an assessed impact of *'slight'* significance. The Environmental Statement has concluded that the assessment *"shows that the 70dB(A)  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  (free field) criterion for short duration activities such as soil stripping can be achieved"* and, therefore, the proposed development is capable of being operated in accordance with guidance.
- 7.31 Following an evaluation of potential temporary noise effects, the applicant company records that, during the planned temporary operations, the predicted noise levels *"at all of the noise sensitive receptors studied would be substantially below the 70 dB  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  (free field) limit for temporary operations ... Depending upon the duration of activity, the noise impact would be considered to be no worse than minor/slight adverse"*.
- 7.32 The applicant company explains that the predicted noise levels *"at each noise sensitive receptor would be in the main below the 55 dB  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  (free field) limit ... for all phases"* and in terms of longer term impacts, *"where the 55 dB  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  (free field) limit is met the noise impact would also be below the criterion based*

---

<sup>15</sup> The residential properties that were assessed comprise: Killerby Hall; Killerby Farm; The Bungalow; Broad Close Farm; Broad Close Cottage; Hook House Farm; Glebe Cottage; Hookcar Hill; and Oran House.



upon  $\leq L_{A90,T}$ , which is considered to be negligible, except at Hook House Farm during phases 4A and 5C. During these phases the noise impact predicted at Hook House Farm would be within the criterion  $L_{90} - L_{90+5}$  and therefore considered to be minor/slight adverse. With “the exception of Hook House Farm (53 dB(A)) and Hook Car Hill (54 dB(A)), the 55 dB  $L_{Aeq,1h}$  criterion would apply at all of the identified properties” when assessing potential long-term noise effects from the proposed development. The Environmental Statement also notes that the assessment undertaken by the applicant company “considers operations at their closest proximity to properties...is likely to reduce to negligible with distance and as operations progress”.

- 7.33 It also concludes that the noise assessments undertaken demonstrate that “noise levels can conform to the [nationally accepted] noise criterion ... except at Broad Close Farm during phase 3B”. However, it is also important to note that the Environmental Statement confirms that at this location “where the farm buildings [are proposed to be] demolished and the mineral excavated, the industrial farm buildings, e.g. the barns and outbuildings, would provide noise attenuation and would therefore be retained for the period that the farmhouse remains a residence”.
- 7.34 In terms of proposed mitigation to help alleviate any potential adverse noise impacts upon the amenity of the local community and the environment as a whole, the Environmental Statement has stated that such measures have been considered within the “context of the site design and as part of Tarmac Ltd’s good operational practice adopted at all sites”. It has confirmed that mitigation measures “have been considered within the context of the site design and as part of Tarmac Ltd’s good operational practice adopted at all sites”.
- 7.35 Firstly, in terms of site design, temporary soil storage mounds are proposed within the application site and on the boundary and illustrated on the phasing plans accompanying the planning application. The applicant company states that these measures would “provide acoustic barriers for mobile plant within the site. The soil mounds have been created through working of previous phases and would continue to provide mitigation against proposed operations”. The Environmental Statement also states that the applicant company “operates an Environmental Management Policy for [the] control of site noise”. The management system includes certain mitigation measures, which include, for example, measures to ensure that new “plant would be used where practical and regular maintenance undertaken, including maintenance related to noise emissions”.
- 7.36 The relevant *Development Plan* policies against which to assess the proposed development’s effects associated with noise and their potential for significant adverse impact upon both the local community and the natural environment have been outlined in Section 6.0 of this report. They include

'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/1, and, in particular, criterion (b), which requires developments to be acceptable in both siting and scale, criterion (c) which seeks applicants to demonstrate, through the method and proposed programme of works that the impacts of the development would be minimised, criterion (e) which directs that applications must be assessed for their environmental and amenity safeguards to effectively mitigate against the impacts of a proposed development and criterion (i) seeking to ensure against unacceptable cumulative impacts, 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/14 ensuring proposals do not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts, Hambleton District Council's Core Strategy Policy CP21 (which seeks measures to mitigate against the effects of noise), Hambleton's Development Policies DP1 (which seeks to preserve amenity) and DP44 (which seeks to direct noise-generating activities away from noise-sensitive locations).

- 7.37 Following the initial advertisement of the application, responses were received from the local community with understandable concerns about noise. These included concerns expressed surrounding the potential noise impacts from the development, questioning the methods undertaken by the applicant company in the assessment of potential noise and suggesting that guidance noise levels will be exceeded. The opportunity was taken by the applicant company to address these concerns explaining that the noise assessment had been based on "*information provided by the equipment manufacturers*". Nevertheless, notwithstanding any demonstrable evidence to suggest that significant adverse effects would ensue as a result of noise generating activities associated with the proposed development, the applicant company would seek to establish a Community Liaison Group for Killerby Quarry, should planning permission be forthcoming, that would facilitate resolution of any noise-related complaints arising from the proposed development. Furthermore, the proposals put forward by the applicant company also provide for the on-going monitoring of noise, controllable through the mechanism of appropriately worded planning conditions that could be imposed, in the event of a decision to grant permission.
- 7.38 The relevant expert on this particular aspect of the proposal, the Hambleton District Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO), has been consulted on the proposals put forward and, after scrutinising the information submitted by the applicant company confirmed, upon initial consultation, that the "*the details and proposals submitted by the applicant company are acceptable*". Importantly, the response confirmed that the application met the guidelines set out in *Minerals Policy Statement 2: Controlling and mitigating the environmental effects of mineral extraction in England – Annex 2: Noise*. While these were the relevant guidelines at the time of the submission of the planning application, they have since been replaced by the NPPF (supported by the technical guidance with the NPPG). The advice and guidance nonetheless carries the thrust of the preceding advice. The NPPG provides guidance on assessing the potential noise impacts from minerals-related

development proposals stating the total “*noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$* ” whilst recognising that for short-term related activities associated with quarries, “*such as soil-stripping, the construction and removal of baffle mounds, soil storage mounds and spoil heaps, construction of new permanent landforms and aspects of site road construction and maintenance*” a 70 dB(A)  $L_{Aeq, 1h}$  (free field) limit should be regarded as the normal maximum. As referred within Section 4.0 above, the most recent consultation (*the 2016 consultation*) with the relevant expert, the District Council’s Environmental Health Officer, returned no response at variance with that previously made.

7.39 The information submitted by the applicant company in respect of this particular effect of the development, i.e. noise, is considered to be both adequate and sufficient upon which to determine the planning application and due regard has been had to the advice provided within national planning guidance relevant to noise and minerals-related development (NPPG paragraphs 013 and 019 to 022 of Section 27 and paragraphs 001-003, 006 & 008 within Section 30 refer). Upon review of the applicant company’s environmental impact assessment with specific regard to noise and the responses to consultation as well as the representations made during the course of processing the application, there are considered to be limited effects, both in severity and duration, arising as a result of noise-generating activities associated with the proposed development. The proposed mitigation measures discussed in the noise chapter of the ES (July 2010) have been considered and it is recognised that the layout of the operational site has been carefully designed such that some of soil and overburden would be used for the construction of soil mounds that would act as noise barriers to increase attenuation from the site as well as providing a visual screen. The location of these bunds is shown on the plan accompanying the application, ‘[Phasing Plan-Composite](#)’ (drwg no. NT10306/12/Fig3.1 rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015). The proposed ‘*environmental management*’ measures that are also proposed to be implemented on site have similarly been duly considered and no reasons have been found to doubt their effectiveness.

7.40 Whilst of obvious and understandable concern to the local community, the effects of noise associated with the proposed development are considered to be capable of being adequately mitigated by artificial and natural barriers and capable of being acceptable in land-use planning terms should appropriate levels of control through the imposition of planning conditions be deemed sufficient. Suitably worded planning conditions could be attached to a permission that would ensure working operations are performed within acceptable noise thresholds as discussed above and these are conveyed in the recommendation within this Officer report for consideration by Members. Acknowledging the degree of consistency of the extant policies of the *Development Plan* with the NPPF, the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any significant material conflict with ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/1 in particular criteria (b), (c), (e) and (i), and ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy

4/14, or Richmondshire District Council's (RDC's) Core Strategy Policy CP3, Hambleton District Council's (HDC's) Policies CP1 and CP21, and HDC's Development Policies DP1, DP32 and DP44.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.41 The consideration and assessment of this application is made also with due regard to national policy expressed within the core principles of the NPPF (4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> principles of Paragraph 17 refer) seeking improved amenity for all and reduced levels of pollution. The national planning policy with particular relevance to noise can be found within Paragraph 69 (with reference to health-related impacts of noise), Paragraph 109 (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point relating to avoiding unacceptable adverse noise effects), Paragraph 120 (seeking appropriate development in appropriate places ensuring account is taken of the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity and potential pollution sensitivity), and Paragraph 123 (which is linked to the [Noise Policy Statement for England](#), published in March 2010).
- 7.42 This is further reiterated within Paragraph 144 which requires authorities to ensure that "*there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment [and] human health*" (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point refers) and, particularly the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point therein, requiring consideration of the possibility of controls, measures in mitigation, removal of sources of noise or limiting their levels at noise sensitive receptors. The acknowledged aims of which seek to prevent unacceptable risks to the natural environment and/or those living in communities being adversely affected by, *inter alia*, noise impacts. Planning authorities are advised, in NPPG's Section 27, on how noise, with particular regard to mineral development, should be controlled and ensure that new developments are appropriate for their proposed location in making decisions on planning applications and within Section 30 to the NPPG, Paragraph 008 advises that cumulative impacts of noise that can arise and also their effects upon wildlife and ecosystems, particularly upon designated sites, as well as those living in the vicinity of proposed developments should also be considered.
- 7.43 The national policy relating to potential noise effects from new development is to mitigate and reduce to a minimum such potential effects to avoid potential adverse health-related and amenity impacts. The NPPF clarifies that authorities should consider whether it is practicable to control or reduce noise levels, or provide mitigation for the impact of noise when considering development proposals and reaffirms the previous advice of MPS2 on the acceptability of noise limits in relation to minerals-related development proposals (NPPF Paragraph 109 and Paragraph 123 refer).
- 7.44 Taking into consideration the environmental and other additional information received both within the original submission and during the processing of this

planning application assessing the potential significance of any noise-related impacts arising from the proposed development; the representations and responses to consultation from experts in their related field free from objection; the measures proposed in mitigation (provided they are implemented following best practice) which are considered to be adequate and capable of being controlled, and no conflict of any significant material degree with the extant policies that comprise the *Development Plan*, there is nothing arising that would give rise to a conclusion that noise-related impacts arising from the proposed development would be, materially, both significant or adverse to such a degree as to warrant a refusal on this ground alone and no argument to sustain such a refusal is found to be sufficiently compelling in this instance.

#### Air Quality

- 7.45 With regards to the assessment of any potential significant adverse effects of the proposed development as a result of degradation of air quality through the generation of dust associated with the proposed development, the Environmental Statement has acknowledged that while dust can be created by ground disturbance, whatever the activity, mineral operations are often the source of elevated levels of dust in the immediate vicinity of the workings. In respect of this particular proposal, dust can be generated as a result of loading and/or placement of materials (be they mineral, soils, interburden and/or overburden), their processing (in relation to the mineral) as well as their haulage. It explains that the *“majority of dust emissions from the site are expected to be large particles (>30µm) which do not propagate more than 100m”*. The Environmental Statement goes on to confirm, however, that *“to account for smaller particle emission, all properties within 500m of site have been considered potentially dust-sensitive”*. These properties include Killerby Hall, Oran House, Broad Close Cottage, Hook House Farm, Glebe Cottage, Green Gate Farm and Hookcar Hill. In assessing the impact of dust as being, geographically, of local importance, the impact has been assessed as *‘neutral’* and *‘negligible’* in its significance once mitigated.
- 7.46 The Environmental Statement concludes that the assessment that has been undertaken has found that with appropriate mitigation measures in place *“there would be insignificant impacts of dust on properties located in proximity to the site”*. It also concludes that *“there would be no adverse impacts on health from any increases in PM<sub>10</sub> and the Air Quality Strategy would not be exceeded”*. The applicant company also considers that cumulative effects *“are not predicted to be likely”* from the proposed development, in relation to the former Ellerton Quarry.
- 7.47 Following the initial advertisement of the application in 2010, concern was expressed from some members of the local community surrounding a lack of clarification in the Environmental Statement to the potential impact on air quality and questions were raised on whether there will be *“monitoring of on-site dust mitigation measures in place”*. The agent acting on behalf of the

applicant company responded to such concerns by stating that the potential for dust from the proposed development “*would be actively controlled through rigorous site management in accordance with Tarmac’s Environmental Management Policy*”.

7.48 To this effect, the Environmental Statement further confirms in its conclusions within the ‘Air Quality’ chapter (ES Chapter 10) that the *Site Manager* would be “*responsible for the implementation of control measures on site in order to minimise dust nuisance*” and such measures would form part of site’s [Environmental Management Strategy](#). It confirms that these measures comprise of the following:

- *sufficient water would be available to enable dust suppression measures to be carried out when required;*
- *unsurfaced vehicle access roads would be suitably graded and watered during dry conditions as necessary;*
- *the access road and other hard surfaced areas and roads would be kept clean at all times and watered by motorised spray units during dry conditions;*
- *drop heights from the front loading shovel to the crusher would be minimised;*
- *wind speed and direction would be taken into account when organising operations;*
- *vehicle speed limits would be controlled to 10mph to prevent dust arising from vehicle access roads;*
- *vehicle exhausts would be directed away from the ground to minimise dust disturbance; and*
- *soil storage areas, topsoil bunds and restored areas would be seeded with grass as soon as practicable to prevent wind erosion of soils.*

7.49 Further measures put forward in mitigation include the availability of generally moisture-laden soils *in situ*, the grass-seeding of soil stockpiles, application of acknowledged ‘*best practice*’ in mineral processing, minimisation of areas of ‘*bare ground*’ at any point in time during operations, spraying of haul roads, sheeting of loads on vehicles, wheel-washing and on-site speed restrictions.

7.50 The relevant *Development Plan* policies against which to assess the proposed development’s effects associated with dust and their potential for significant adverse impacts upon the quality of air both for the local community and for the natural environment have been outlined in Section 6.0 of this report. They include ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/1, and, in particular, criterion (b) which requires developments to be acceptable in both siting and scale, criterion (c) which seeks applicants to demonstrate, through the method and proposed programme of works that the impacts of the development would be minimised, criterion (e) which directs that applications must be assessed for their environmental and amenity safeguards to effectively mitigate against the impacts of a proposed development, and criterion (i) which seeks to ensure

that the cumulative impacts of development proposals are taken into account and assessed as being acceptable, 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/14 ensuring proposals do not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts, as well as RDC's Core Strategy Policy CP3 (seeking the minimisation of airborne pollution), and HDC's Core Strategy Policy CP1 (seeking to protect air quality).

- 7.51 While those making representations in respect of the proposed development have referred to the potential for adverse effects arising from the generation of dust, the applicant company has proposed a *Dust Management Plan* that would require the recording of wind direction and reporting of information to the County Planning Authority as well as other measures in mitigation explained below.
- 7.52 The District Council's Environmental Health Officer, the acknowledged expert in this field, having scrutinised the information submitted by the applicant company, has returned no comments with specific regard to the air quality issues (including dust) that have the potential to arise from a development of this nature.
- 7.53 The information submitted by the applicant company in respect of this particular effect of the development (i.e. potential detrimental impact upon air quality and in particular dust) is considered to be both adequate and sufficient upon which to determine the planning application and due regard has been had to the advice provided within national planning guidance relevant to air quality and minerals-related development proposals (NPPG paragraph 013 of Section 27 and paragraphs 001, 005 and 009 of Section 32 (specifically relating to air quality) refer). Upon review of the applicant company's environmental impact assessment with specific regard to air quality and, in particular, dust and the responses to consultation as well as the representations made during the course of processing the application, they are considered to be limited in their effects, both in terms of severity and duration, arising as a result of dust-generating activities associated with the proposed development. The proposed mitigation measures discussed in the '*Air Quality*' chapter of the Environmental Statement of containment, suppression, reduced drop heights, arrestment, wind dynamics management, covering, vehicle wheel-wash facilities and ensuring vehicle exhausts point away from the ground have been considered. In addition to these safeguards, the applicant company proposes an *Environmental Management Strategy*. It is recognised, therefore, that these would adequately mitigate against significant adverse effects arising from the proposed development in terms of air quality and, in particular, dust.
- 7.54 It is acknowledged that the potential for adverse effect upon air quality and, in particular, through the generation of dust, would be an obvious and understandable concern to the local community. However, these effects are considered to be capable of being adequately mitigated by the measures

proposed by the applicant company and are considered capable of being acceptable in land-use planning terms should appropriate levels of control through the imposition of planning conditions be deemed sufficient. Suitably worded planning conditions could be attached to a permission that would ensure working operations are performed within acceptable thresholds and these are conveyed in the recommendation within this Officer report for consideration by Members.

- 7.55 In acknowledging the degree of consistency of the extant policies of the *Development Plan* with the NPPF, the proposed development is not considered to give rise to significant conflict with 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/1, and, in particular, criteria (b), (c), (e) and (i) as well as 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/14 and RDC's Core Strategy Policy CP3 and HDC's Core Strategy Policy CP1.

Other material considerations

- 7.56 The safeguarding of local air quality is embedded in national planning policy contained in the NPPF's *core principles* (the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> principles of Paragraph 17 refer) which seek to improve amenity for all and reduce levels of pollution. The national planning policy with particular relevance to air quality and, in particular, dust can be found within Paragraph 69, Paragraph 109 (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point), Paragraph 120 (which seeks to ensure that account is taken of the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity and potential pollution sensitivity), Paragraph 123 and Paragraph 144 which requires authorities to ensure that "*there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment [and] human health*" (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point refers) and, particularly the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point therein, which seek to prevent the natural environment and/or those living in communities being adversely affected by, *inter alia*, dust and particle emissions and that these are either controlled, mitigated or removed at source. Planning authorities are advised, in NPPG's Section 32, of the need to be mindful of the need to manage and improve air quality and ensure that new developments are appropriate for their proposed location in making decisions on planning applications.
- 7.57 Taking into consideration the environmental and other additional information received both within the original submission and during the processing of this planning application assessing the potential significance of any impacts relating to air quality and, in particular, dust arising from the proposed development; the representations and responses to consultation from experts in their related field free from objection; the measures proposed in mitigation (provided they are implemented following best practice) which are considered to be adequate and capable of being controlled, and no conflict of any significant material degree with the extant policies that comprise the *Development Plan*, there is nothing arising that would give rise to a conclusion that impacts arising from the proposed development relating to air quality and,



in particular, dust, would be, materially, both significant or adverse to such a degree as to warrant a refusal on this ground alone and no argument to sustain such a refusal is found to be sufficiently compelling in this instance.

Landscape and visual impacts

- 7.58 *Landscape impacts* are distinguishable from visual impacts in that they relate to changes in the fabric, character and quality of the landscape; whereas, *visual impacts* relate to specific changes in views and the attendant impacts therefrom upon others such as those living in the vicinity of the site or those enjoying the outdoors along public footpaths for instance.
- 7.59 With respect to landscape impacts, the assessment has taken into account the potential landscape impacts in respect of the landscape character of the site ‘*per se*’, the Vale of Mowbray, the former Special Landscape Area and the wider study area as well as the impacts upon the setting of the Historic Park & Garden of Killerby Hall. The Environmental Statement has acknowledged that the proposed development would alter the landscape character of the area by the very nature of the extraction activities exploiting the sand and gravel from the land and changing the landscape from one of being predominantly agricultural in nature to one of a mosaic of agriculture and wetlands. However, the Environmental Statement has noted that “*the wider area includes neighbouring quarries at Kiplin Hall, Scorton and Ellerton; these are currently giving rise to similar changes to the local landscape character of this area and this strategy is supported by the [Swale and Ure Washlands Project](#)”*. The landscape chapter of the Environmental Statement concludes that “*the application site is relatively well screened by the gently rolling topography and the surrounding hedgerows and woodland*”. The environmental impact assessment that has been undertaken has found that potential impacts “*on the local landscape character would not exceed slight adverse during operations changing to beneficial on restoration*” and that the progressive restoration on site “*would limit the extent of disturbed area affected at any one time*”.
- 7.60 In terms of cumulative effects, the Environmental Statement acknowledges that due to the close proximity of the former Ellerton Quarry and Kiplin Hall Quarry workings and with the presence of Scorton Quarry 3km to the north-west, the proposed development does have the potential to result in cumulative impacts, but not necessarily significantly adverse. The Environmental Statement explains that such sites are “*well screened by surrounding woodland meaning they are not intervisible; therefore any cumulative impacts of these sites would be imperceptible*”. The applicant company also clarifies within its Statement that the proposed Killerby Quarry would not be anticipated to be concurrently operational as these other three sites by the time the Killerby site could commence mineral working.

- 7.61 With respect to potential visual effects of the proposed development upon the views currently enjoyed by residents in proximity to the application site, the assessment has taken into account views from Killerby Hall, Hall Cottages, Killerby Farm and the Bungalow, Hook Car Hill Farmhouse, Hook House Farm, Denvon (Plane Tree Lane), Glebe Cottage, Glebe Farm, Broadclose Farm Broadclose Cottages, West Lodge, Kiplin Hall and gardens, Ellerton Caravan Park, the A1(T), Low Street, Lumley Lane, Greengate Lane and Tickergate Lane as well as views from the proposed diverted public right of way (footpath) south of Killerby Hall, the existing public right of way (footpath) south of Hook House Farm and views further afield along the network of footpaths and bridleways in the vicinity of the proposed site. All of these views have been deemed in the assessment to be of *local* importance as opposed to district, regional, national or international importance. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, regardless of their level of significance, they have been assessed as being both '*short-term*' and '*reversible*' effects. Both the '*adverse*' (during the operational phases of the proposed development) and '*beneficial*' (during and after the restoration of each of the phases of the proposed development) significance of these impacts has ranged on the continuum from '*imperceptible*' to '*moderate*' with the exception of the case in respect of Broad Close Farm; the significance of impact of which has been assessed as '*substantial adverse*'. However, in the case of Broad Close Farm such '*substantial adverse*' impact is assessed as existing only insofar as the property remains '*in situ*'. As proposed, the property would be demolished and, therefore, upon such event, the '*substantial adverse*' effect would cease to subsist.
- 7.62 The Environmental Statement has acknowledged that there would be "*some significant impacts on the visual amenity of properties and users of rights of way closest to the site...and for users of the diverted footpath to the north-west of the site and the existing path south of the site*". However, it concludes that in respect of other visual receptors within the study area, the potential "*impacts would not be significant*".
- 7.63 By way of mitigating against the effects of the proposed development, the applicant company has put forward a number of measures within its Environment Statement so as to minimise as far as practically possible any potential adverse landscape and visual impacts arising from the proposed development. These measures include the screening of the proposed conveyors with linear soil bunds; the design of site levels to reduce the visual impact of the quarrying operations; progressive restoration to help reduce the duration of disturbance; improved restoration land cover to compensate for the loss of the small area of existing woodland and the hedges; and the creation of lakes with some woodland planting and marginal grassland to enhance the landscape character together with the return of land to agriculture. The Environmental Statement also notes that advance planting is proposed to screen the planned on-site processing plant from Killerby Hall.

- 7.64 The Environmental Statement also proposes that the final restoration scheme would be completed approximately twelve to twenty-four months after the completion of the extraction of the final Phase 5D in the year 2031. It also concludes that the proposed restoration proposals would bring “*significant/moderate beneficial effects to the landscape character of the area and would contribute positively to the wider setting of the Vale of Mowbray*”.
- 7.65 The relevant *Development Plan* policies against which to assess the proposed development’s effects associated with potential significant adverse landscape and visual impacts have been outlined in Section 6.0 of this report. They include ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/1, in particular, criterion (b) requiring the siting and scale of the proposed development to be acceptable, criterion (d) which seeks to ensure that the landscaping and screening of proposed development have been designed so as to effectively mitigate the effects of a proposed development, criterion (e) which directs that applications must be assessed for their environmental and amenity safeguards to effectively mitigate against the impacts of a proposed development and criterion (i) which seeks to ensure that the cumulative impacts of development proposals are taken into account and assessed as being acceptable as well as ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/16 which seeks to ensure that minerals processing plants are sited and designed so as to ensure that any impacts that may arise in respect of those upon the environment or the amenity of the local community are kept to a minimum.
- 7.66 In addition, Richmondshire District Council’s Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3 (supporting the promotion of local landscapes) and CP11 (supporting enhancements of cultural and recreational assets of open space); Hambleton District Council’s Core Strategy Policies CP1 (seeking to protect and enhance the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside) , CP16 (seeking to support initiatives to improve the natural environment and biodiversity) and CP17 (seeking to enhance and respect local landscape context) and its Development Policies DP2 (seeking contributions for landscaping etc.), DP30 (seeking to safeguard and enhance local landscapes), DP32 (seeking landscape enhancement through high quality design) and DP33 (seeking local landscape protection and enhancement through new features reflecting the local landscape) are also considered relevant.
- 7.67 In terms of the consultation responses received in relation to this application, a number of points were raised from both statutory consultees and the local residents in relation to the potential effects upon the landscape and visual amenity of the area. Firstly, Natural England confirmed their satisfaction with the applicant company’s submitted *Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment* (LVIA) of the potential landscape and visual impacts within the Environmental Statement. Natural England also confirmed that “*screening of a low height*

*should be sufficient in effectively limiting views of quarrying activities during the operation of the site”.*

- 7.68 The County Council's in-house adviser on landscape matters, having scrutinised the applicant company's submissions during the course of the processing of this application and has arrived at a view contrary to those returned by Natural England. The County Council's in-house adviser's comments have been outlined earlier in this report within Section 5.0 above.
- 7.69 The adviser commented on the absence of a *Landscape Character Assessment* and stated the proposed development would result in impacts upon the landscape character of the area; visual impacts upon those living nearby, users of Public Rights of Way, and the local road network; and visual impacts upon the setting of the historic designed landscapes and on the River Swale corridor. This was followed by comments that there remained a number of issues with the proposed development, questioning the thoroughness of the applicant company's LVIA and the absence of an assessment of potential cumulative impacts on the relevant landscape character.
- 7.70 The agent on behalf of the applicant company has during the course of the processing of the application explained that the issue of the post glacial landscape has been addressed in both the Phase 1 *Archaeological Assessment* and, in particular, Section 1.9 *Geoarchaeological Assessment*; the loss of some of the low rides within the application site are “*an inevitable consequence of mineral extraction*”; and the lakes have been designed to reflect the depth and extend of the mineral in question and “*seeks to minimise sterilisation rather than them just being based on aesthetic appearance*”.
- 7.71 A number of concerns were also raised from representations from the local community relating to the level of proposed screening within the development, especially in relation to potential impacts upon the amenity of Killerby Hall and the adjacent residential receptors. Responses also considered there to be limited provision within the application site for advance planting and, in particular, there are concerns over the lack of proposed planting to replace the “*loss of a strip of woodland on the east of Killerby Farm*”.
- 7.72 Having received the comments of the County Council's own in-house adviser on landscape matters, the experts acting on behalf of the applicant company have considered the response and have maintained that the information that has been provided to support the application is of sufficient detail to be able to determine the acceptability of the proposed development. It goes further to suggest that views of the development from which the adviser had suggested may be obtained would either be unobtainable or sufficiently obscured by existing features lying within the landscape and local topography. Notwithstanding, the County Council's adviser's comments which stated that “*on the whole, quarrying operations are unlikely to be obtrusive in the wider*

*landscape*” were welcomed by the applicant company as was the absence of any objection to the proposed development whilst acknowledging the understandable concerns of the landscape adviser, but undertook to ensure that the input of such experts would be key to the preparation and development of subsequent strategies for landscaping enhancement.

- 7.73 While acknowledging that there are degrees of thoroughness into which a proposed development’s effects may be assessed, a reasonable and proportionate approach has been taken with regard to the amount of information requested of the applicant company with which to justify its proposals. Regard has also been had to the scale and degree of landscape enhancement opportunities presented by the proposed development which includes 25 hectares of managed woodland and carr, 16.5 hectares of species-rich grassland, 8,000 metres of headland margins (10 metres wide) and 4,280 metres of hedges with trees supporting such that this is considered to be significant in terms of landscape enhancement. Furthermore, the assessment also concluded no direct effects with regard to the non-designated park and garden or listed building.
- 7.74 It is acknowledged that the potential for adverse effect upon landscape would be an obvious and understandable concern to the interested stakeholders. However, these effects are considered to be capable of being adequately mitigated by the measures proposed by the applicant company and are considered capable of being acceptable in land-use planning terms should appropriate levels of control through the imposition of planning conditions be deemed sufficient. Suitably worded planning conditions could be attached to a permission and, as earlier referred, the delivery vehicle of a S106 Legal Agreement is capable of providing the mechanism to address the concerns that have been raised and these are conveyed in the recommendation within this Officer report for consideration by Members.
- 7.75 In terms of policy compliance, it is considered that the proposed screening would protect the environment and those living within the vicinity of the site from potential landscape and visual impacts and it is considered that, subject to the proposed restoration-related mitigation measures (controlled through the provisions of a S106 legal agreement), the proposed development does not give rise to any conflict with ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/1 criterion (d) and ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/16 of the NYMLP; Policies CP1, CP3 and CP11 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policies CP1, CP16 and CP17 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; Development Policies DP2, DP30, DP32 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.76 From a national planning policy perspective, Paragraph 109 of the NPPF confirms that “*the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...protecting and enhancing valued*

*landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils”* and, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF’s aims and objectives in this respect.

*Nature conservation ecology and habitat protection*

- 7.77 The assessment of the effects of the proposed development in respect of the flora and fauna (their conservation and enhancement), and, more specifically, protected species and designated habitats, is included within the Environmental Statement (Chapter 12 refers) which accompanies the planning application. The assessment has acknowledged the importance of each protected species and habitat (for example its rarity, diversity, fragility etc) and their sensitivity and that assessment has used, as part of its basis, the parameters of impact of magnitude as well as extent, duration, reversibility, timing and frequency of the effects of the proposed development.
- 7.78 The habitats that have been assessed have included arable/improved/semi-improved grassland, coarse grassland, dense shrub, plantation woodland, mature broadleaved field trees, broadleaved wet woodland, hedgerows, the River Swale, Fiddale Beck, drainage ditches, and areas of standing water. The assessment has identified that possible effects could arise from the proposed development as a result of direct habitat loss etc. as well as possible adverse impacts upon hydrology. These effects have been identified as potentially ‘*adverse*’ during the operational phases of the proposed development, but would then become ‘*beneficial*’ effects upon restoration and thereafter. With the exception of the potential impacts upon the River Swale (resulting from, *inter alia*, disturbance associated with the construction of the two bridges), having been assessed as being, in terms of magnitude, both ‘*substantial*’ and ‘*adverse*’ without mitigation, the impacts upon all other afore-mentioned habitats have been assessed for the majority as being adverse impacts of ‘*negligible/minor*’ significance; although the adverse effect upon mature field trees, through the loss of thirty in number, is acknowledged to be potentially a magnitude of ‘*moderate*’ significance without appropriate mitigation.
- 7.79 With respect to species, the applicant company explains that bats, birds, great-crested newt (GCN), otter, badger, white-clawed crayfish, lamprey/salmonids and species of reptiles have been assessed with regards the potential for significant adverse impacts. Bat surveys of the site have been undertaken in 2009, 2014 and 2016. They included:
- dusk vantage point surveys of Broad Close Farm,
  - dusk bat transect survey,
  - dusk and dawn car transect survey,
  - remote monitoring.
- 7.80 Without appropriate mitigation, ‘*minor adverse*’ effects have been assessed resulting from the proposed development upon species of bats through habitat

loss and disturbance. While acknowledging the existence of a local population of *pipistrelle bats* that would be directly and adversely impacted by the proposed development (i.e. the proposed demolition of buildings at Broad Close Farm and the loss of seventeen of the thirty mature trees that are thought to be likely to be suitable for supporting roosting bats), the assessment has found this unlikely to be significant by dint of the small population.

- 7.81 With respect to species of birds, the assessment that has been undertaken found, in the absence of any appropriate mitigation measures, a magnitude of *'moderate adverse'* effects arising in the event of proposed vegetation clearance works taking place and direct habitat loss were the proposed development phases to be implemented. No impacts have been predicted in respect of GCNs due to their absence during any survey work. A magnitude of *'negligible'* has been concluded in the assessment with regard to any potential impacts upon the local otter population due to the limited scale of any direct loss of relevant habitat; although the potential for *'moderate adverse'* impacts exists, in the absence of appropriate mitigation, when considering the potential for harm through disturbance. Only *'minor adverse'* impacts have been assessed in respect of badger without mitigation; notwithstanding the direct loss of two outlier setts on the basis that *"more well used setts [are] likely to be present"*. A *'negligible'* impact has been found to exist in respect of reptiles due to there being little value to reptiles in the habitat that is proposed to be lost as a result of the proposed development.
- 7.82 The potential for *'substantial adverse'* impacts exists, however, in respect of the species of white-clawed crayfish and lamprey/salmonids in the absence of any appropriate mitigation.
- 7.83 The environmental impact assessment of the proposed development has identified mitigation measures proposed by the applicant company to mitigate against the above effects of the development. These include, *inter alia*, conducting *presence/checking surveys* prior to works commencing (with specific respect to white-clawed crayfish, any found would be collected (by those licenced to do so), the provision of thirty bat boxes, the *"creation of a bespoke bat barn"* within the proposed site and twenty bird nest boxes; ensuring any outside lighting is designed so as to minimise any potential harmful effects; the creation of foraging habitat for species of birds, bats, otter, badger and brown hare too as well as the retention of the existing mature tree line within the centre of the proposed site maintaining a valuable wildlife corridor.
- 7.84 This is proposed to be augmented by the measures in mitigation in respect of habitat which comprise the creation of areas of dense scrub along the River Swale, areas of species-rich grassland, three large lakes with associated marsh habitat and a network of small ponds, 222 linear metres of ditches, 22.3 hectares of additional landscaping in the form of woodland, the return of 132.1

hectares of agricultural land and 4,380 linear metres of hedgerows interspersed with trees every thirty metres.

- 7.85 The restoration of the Killerby site to wetland, the applicant company has explained, “*would further extend and enhance the wetland habitats within the Swale Valley*”. The location of such wetland areas has therefore been determined by the depth of mineral reserve across the site. The applicant company has explained that the restoration design has sought to retain as much of the existing tree cover as possible and that it would “*include pools and grassland bordered by retained mature trees and hedges to enhance conditions for the regionally important local population of Soprano Pipistrelle bats and for a range of farmland bird species that have suffered national decline*” as well as including “*an irregular shaped lake bordered by retained trees in order to provide an ornithological habitat of county ornithological importance*” and “*landscape planting to maintain key green corridors within and around the site throughout the operational period, together with new wetlands to enhance the ecological value of the river corridor*”. Wildlife corridors, the applicant company explains, are proposed to be created that would “*connect the site to surrounding areas, thus creating linkages with surrounding habitats. Linking the restored site to existing habitats would improve species migration*”.
- 7.86 Relevant extant *Development Plan* policies against which to assess the proposed development’s affect upon the natural environment including protected species are ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/1 and, in particular, criterion (b) of that policy which requires developments to acceptable in both siting and scale, criterion (c) which seeks to ensure applicants demonstrate through their proposed methodology and work programme that the impacts of the development would be minimised, criterion (e) which directs that applications must be assessed for their environmental and amenity safeguards to effectively mitigate against the impacts of a proposed development and criterion (i) seeking to ensure against unacceptable cumulative impacts, ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/6a which seeks to ensure that protection is afforded to areas of nature conservation interest and importance, ‘*saved*’ NYMLP Policy 4/14 ensuring proposals do not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts.
- 7.87 Within the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy, Policies CP3 and CP12, are similarly considered relevant as are Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy and its accompanying Development Policies DP2, DP31 and DP33.
- 7.88 While representations received by the County Planning Authority question the scale and degree of the survey work undertaken by the applicant company, it is acknowledged that the Environmental Statement which has accompanied the planning application had been subject to a ‘*scoping exercise*’ and a formal [\*Scoping Opinion\*](#) was formally adopted by the County Planning Authority which



'scoped' those matters either 'in' or 'out' of the list of those matters requiring surveys to be undertaken to inform the environmental impact assessment of the proposed development.

- 7.89 Those with whom the County Planning Authority has consulted during the processing of this particular application have included the County Council's own in-house adviser on matters of ecology, the Environment Agency and Natural England. During the processing of the application clarification has been sought from the applicant company regarding the quantity of hedgerows to be included as part of the restoration on site, an exact quantum of hedgerows to be replaced in relation to those lost during the operational phase of the quarry; notwithstanding the acknowledgement that the associated habitat of the hedgerows is considered to be of local ecological value, being species-poor, but nevertheless providing linkages across the site suitable for use by a range of wildlife, particularly where field trees are present.
- 7.90 As earlier referred within Section 4.0 of this report, Natural England have confirmed that they are satisfied with the range of ecological survey work that was carried out as part of the EIA and also the methodologies used during the information gathering process, acknowledged that the proposed restoration of the site has the potential to create an area of diverse habitats that could underpin existing species in the area and is satisfied that the proposed mitigation is appropriate and, so long as it is implemented, it could "*ensure that the value of the restored site for biodiversity is both maintained and enhanced*".
- 7.91 The County Council's own in-house adviser on ecological matters gave an opinion that the '*biodiversity gains*' should be increased and distributed more evenly throughout the application site and should include "*habitat connectivity between the water bodies, contoured woodland/ scrub planting and a much greater emphasis on biodiversity and floodplain connectivity in the western area*" of the site reiterating in a further response that there "*is an outstanding discrepancy between the level of biodiversity benefit being promoted within the ES and the actual benefits that can be delivered through the restoration and long term management proposed*"; notwithstanding an expression of satisfaction with additional survey work that had been undertaken to address the issued that had been raised.
- 7.92 With specific respect to the proposed Bird Management Plan (2014), this was also met with satisfaction, whilst at the same time, seeking clarification on the management of the restored site. Notwithstanding the valuable comments received by the County Planning Authority following consultation, it is noted that these comments have not been of sufficient gravity to constitute an objection to the development as proposed and, instead, the imposition of appropriate planning conditions has been recommended should planning permission be forthcoming. This is similarly the case with respect to the

recommendation of matters to be included within the proposed S106 Legal Agreement.

- 7.93 The Environment Agency responded to consultation initially stating there to be scant information provided with regard to the scale of biodiversity enhancements, or the timescales for their delivery and management and therefore conditions should be included in any planning permission. However, during March 2014, the applicant company amended the Environmental Statement to reflect changes in the habitat types that make up the proposed restored site and address the matters raised by the Agency.
- 7.94 It is acknowledged that, in terms of ecological considerations, the *River Swale* Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) encroaches into the northern part of the application site, affecting both the areas referred to as '*Killerby West*' and '*Killerby East*'. However, no significant adverse impact has been found to potentially exist upon this designation.
- 7.95 Two other SINC's are situated circa 1.3km to the east of the application site. *The Swales Lake* Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is situated circa 1.5km to the north west of the application site. This site is of interest for its diverse population of breeding birds and large numbers of wintering wildfowl and waders. Given the location of the application site in relation to these other designations, it is considered unlikely that the proposed development would have an adverse impact.
- 7.96 While the habitats that could be lost to the proposed extraction works primarily comprise arable fields and plantation woodland "*of low to local ecological value with a number of field trees of local to parish value...*", with appropriate mitigation in place including undertaking presence surveys and implementing precautionary working methods, "*the risk of harming or disturbing protected species during works can be minimised*". Furthermore, the habitats that would arise as a result of the proposed restoration scheme are considered to be capable of producing a mosaic that could support a range of fauna including species of bat and birds etc. that potentially could enhance biodiversity in this particular part of the county. The findings within environmental impact assessment undertaken point to "*the development of additional wetlands enhancing both the ornithological value of the site and strengthening and enhancing the series of wetlands, of national ornithological importance, strung along the River Swale*". Once fully restored, the site has the potential to further enhance the corridor of the River Swale, by underpinning the ecological value of the area. This enhancement, however, is measured to a degree by consideration of the concerns of the Ministry of Defence in respect of safeguarding against the hazard of bird strike and this is therefore proposed by the applicant company to be enshrined within a *Bird Management Strategy* and be controlled by the mechanism of a draft S106 legal agreement.

7.97 Provided mitigation measures that have been put forward by the applicant company are implemented and maintained during the course of the development, impacts of the proposed development that could be regarded as significantly material are considered unlikely to arise in this particular instance. Those effects likely to arise are considered to be capable of being controlled by the use of appropriately worded planning conditions were planning permission to be forthcoming. It is, however, considered important that the details of the restoration and management of the site should be secured through a S106 Legal Agreement. With these considerations taken into account, the proposed development is not considered to conflict with the relevant policies to which reference has been made above i.e. criteria (b), (c), (e) and (i) of 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/1, 'saved' Policy 4/6a of the NYMLP and 'saved' NYMLP Policy 4/14. Similarly, no conflict is considered to arise with Policies CP3 and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy; Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; Development Policies DP2, DP31 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

7.98 Section 11 of the NPPF considers the issues of conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 109 confirms that "*the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment*" and, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aims and objectives in this respect.

*Cultural heritage and archaeology*

7.99 In terms of archaeology, the applicant company's submitted Environmental Statement has identified the impacts (both adverse and beneficial) as being the destruction of potential archaeological and/or paleoenvironmental remains during the proposed phases of mineral extraction and during the landscaping of the site as well as the potential for effects upon the settings of [Listed Buildings](#) and/or [Scheduled Monuments](#) and the designed landscape of the Killerby Hall parkland. While potential '*regional*' geographical significance considered together with the '*adverse*' impact resulting from their potential destruction has deserved a '*medium-to-high*' significance rating in the assessment, the *archaeological desk-based assessment* that has been undertaken as part of the EIA of the proposed development, "*revealed no certain buried archaeological remains surviving within the proposed development areas*" and has determined that, although both archaeological and/or paleoenvironmental remains could potentially exist, they are not thought to be of national significance.

7.100 The archaeological assessment found the prospect of opportunities for archaeological interpretation and improvements to intellectual access to be potential beneficial impacts arising from the proposed development. The submitted Environmental Statement has explained that the information known

from previous archaeological studies both in and around the application site together with that recovered from the programme of evaluation works “*has established that the ground below the ploughzone in the extraction area could contain archaeological remains, although it is unlikely these are of national importance*”. It confirmed, however, that notwithstanding “*an archaeological watching brief would be undertaken across all areas during topsoil stripping in advance of extraction*”.

- 7.101 During the course of the processing of the application, the applicant company submitted to the County Planning Authority (in November 2012 and later in November 2014) an [‘Archaeological Scheme of Works’](#) report, carried out in respect of the peat deposits present within sub-Phase 1B within the application site (an area now no longer proposed to be worked) and further submitted a revision to the *‘Cultural Heritage’* chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 7 refers).
- 7.102 In mitigation, should Members resolve to grant planning permission, the applicant company has proposed the imposition of a condition to be attached to any permission that would serve to limit the development such that no development would commence without having first received the County Planning Authority’s written approval of a [Scheme of Investigation](#), including a timetable, for an [Archaeological Watching Brief](#) on all topsoil stripping and peat removal, targeted excavation of the peat deposits identified in Figure 7.1, and palaeoenvironmental analysis (as outlined in 7.3.3-7.3.9 of the Environmental Statement).
- 7.103 In terms of cultural heritage assets, the Environmental Statement explained that the proposed operations on site “*would not be visible from any of the cultural heritage sites (heritage assets) within the study area and their settings would not be adversely affected*”. Only ‘*slight adverse*’ effects (during the proposed operations) and ‘*slight beneficial*’ (upon restoration) effects have been found to potentially exist in respect of the proposed development’s effects upon the settings of [Listed Buildings](#) and upon the setting of the Killerby park designed landscape. ‘*Neutral*’ impacts of ‘*imperceptible*’ significance have been assessed as resulting in respect of scheduled monuments by dint of the absence of visibility.
- 7.104 The relevant local *Development Plan* policy context is considered to comprise Policies CP3, CP11, and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy and Development Policies DP2, DP28, DP29, DP30 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD. These policies also contain landscape-related policies and these are considered relevant in the context of potential effects on the setting of cultural heritage assets.
- 7.105 Historic England (formerly English Heritage) responded to consultation, raising no objections to the proposed development and recommending that it

be determined “*in accordance with national and local policy guidance*” and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.

- 7.106 The County Council’s own in-house adviser on matters relating to archaeology has confirmed that in respect of the additional archaeological information that has been submitted “*the significance of the expected archaeological resource has been determined, and that the level of harm has been established as acceptable*” and, having reviewed the revised [Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation](#) (November 2014) has considered it to be acceptable. Notwithstanding, should planning permission be forthcoming, conditions have been recommended for consideration for imposition upon any grant of consent.
- 7.107 In terms of cultural heritage, there are a number of [Listed Buildings](#) within close proximity to the application site; immediately adjacent to the application site lies Killerby Hall, of which the stable element is listed and other listed buildings lie proximate to the application site, but further afield than Killerby Hall. Three [Scheduled Ancient Monuments](#) are also present within close proximity to the application site. However, it is considered that appropriate screening mitigation is in place during the operational phase of the site to limit potential visual effects on the setting of these cultural assets, particularly Killerby Hall. It also considered that the change in the nature of the existing landscape to introduce lakes into the scenery will not adversely detract from the setting of this historic asset.
- 7.108 Taking into consideration that the assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development have been undertaken in accord with the guidance set down in respect of both designated and non-designated heritage assets within the NPPF and also taking into account that the safeguarding of these assets is capable of being controlled by the imposition of appropriately worded conditions to ensure an accurate record of any findings at the site is kept, it is considered that the proposed development does not give rise to any conflict with Policies CP3, CP11 and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy and Development Policies DP2, DP28, DP29, DP30 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.109 The safeguarding against the potential adverse impacts upon interests of cultural and/or historic importance and/or heritage value from the effects associated with proposed developments is embedded within the core principles of the NPPF (10<sup>th</sup> principle of Paragraph 17 refers). The national planning policy with particular relevance to the safeguarding of the historic landscape and interests of heritage value can be found within Paragraph 128 (within Section 12 of the NPPF) that ensures that applicants have regard to the historic environment by assessing both its setting and significance when putting forward proposals and wherever possible avoid or minimising a

proposals impacts upon such interests (Paragraph 129 refers). Additionally, Paragraph 131 through to Paragraph 134 are also relevant in their emphasis upon ensuring that proposed developments are so planned such that their impacts do not give rise to substantial harm upon interests within the historic environment of significance being mindful that a feature of interest may not necessarily be disregarded in any assessment solely by virtue of its non-designation, so long as a both a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken.

- 7.110 Furthermore, the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are also engaged in the determination of this particular application. While this current application, *per se*, does not concern an application for Listed Building Consent nor any proposals directly affecting such designations, it does lie within the vicinity of assets and, therefore, the applicable test against which the County Planning Authority is obliged to assess such proposals is that '*special regard*' must be had to the "*desirability of preserving [such] building[s] or [their] setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which [they] possess*".
- 7.111 Recent case law (*Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v. East Northamptonshire DC and others* [2014] EWCA Civ 137 and *R(on the application of Hughes) v. South Lakeland DC and Interested parties* [2014] EWHC 3979 Admin) has considered the policy in Paragraphs 132 to 134 . In the Court of Appeal in *Barnwell* it was held that, when considering the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings, this should be given '*considerable importance and weight*' and, even where harm would be less than substantial, the balancing act cannot ignore the statutory duty imposed by the provisions of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In essence, Paragraph 134 should be read together with the first part of Paragraph 132 to comply with the obligation imposed by Section 66(1). Furthermore, Paragraph 144 (3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point), requires authorities to ensure that "*there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment*". Planning authorities are advised, in NPPG's Section 18a, of how safeguarding against the potential adverse impacts upon interests of cultural and/or historic importance and/or heritage value should be both assessed and controlled and ensure that new developments are appropriate for their proposed location in making decisions on planning applications.
- 7.112 The specific tests for consideration are whether the proposed development would give rise to a circumstance where substantial harm to the interests of either a listed building or structure or their settings or total loss of their significance would arise as a result of the effects of the development. Special regard must also be had the desirability of preserving any identified designated heritage asset. Where a proposed development is deemed to lead to less than substantial harm, the assessment of the development must be weighed against the attendant public benefits of a proposal.

- 7.113 In the particular instance of this current application, the assessment of the potential effects of the proposed development upon designated assets and their settings concluded there to exist only '*slight*' significance by dint of there being no vistas gained, either to or from, in terms of the listed element of Killerby Hall (the stable) and nor were views of the possible *motte* and *bailey* of Castle Hill or any other scheduled monument found to exist.
- 7.114 The outcome of public consultation and the seeking of expert views through consultation on the application revealed no contrary views against the conclusions of the assessment of visual impacts upon designated assets and/or their settings and acknowledge they are capable of being mitigated to a sufficient degree so as not to be significantly adverse. There are features in the local landscape would serve to minimise any potential significant adverse visual impact upon either of these nearest designated assets or their settings to a level sufficient to be considered acceptable in land use planning terms.
- 7.115 Taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aims and objectives in this respect and the applicable test of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 has, it is considered, been satisfied in this particular instance.

#### Transport and traffic impacts

- 7.116 The assessment of the effects of the proposed development in respect of traffic and transport is included within the Environmental Statement which accompanies the planning application (Chapter 13 refers). With respect to the effects of traffic and transport associated with the proposed development, the assessment has found there to be effects that are of '*local*' significance, geographically, and taking into consideration their *temporary* and *reversible* natures have been assessed as being '*minor*' in their significance.
- 7.117 The Environmental Statement has confirmed that there to be "*no evidence to suggest than (sic.) the application for Killerby Quarry would result in the capacity being reached on any of the roads or junctions within the area*". It has concluded, notwithstanding there being no evidence to suggest an accident problem relating to quarry traffic in the area, as a precaution, the applicant company's consultant recommended that signing should be provided to highlight the proposed Killerby quarry access.
- 7.118 In response to comments returned in consultation and in order to present the revised proposals for access to the site and assess the impact of the development in light of the Highways Agency's plans for the A1(T), further transport information was submitted which included a *Transport Statement* (May 2014). This *Transport Statement* has supplemented the transport chapter of the Environmental Statement.

- 7.119 The *Transport Statement* (May 2014) concluded that there is no evidence to suggest an “*accident problem*” in the vicinity of the application site. The statement confirms the applicant company’s position that the proposed access arrangements to the proposed site “*are suitable to serve the Quarry and would also provide a permanent improvement to Low Street to the benefit of all road users*”. Finally, it has concluded that the proposed development “*would not result in any detriment to highway safety, amenity or condition and therefore the submitted planning application is acceptable in planning terms*”.
- 7.120 Criterion (h) of ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/1 of the NYMLP requires, where appropriate, any proposed transport links to move mineral to market to be acceptable. ‘*Saved*’ Policy 4/13 of the NYMLP, concerned with the impact of traffic, seeks to ensure that the level of vehicle movements likely to be generated can be satisfactorily accommodated by the local highway network. Policy CP3 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy and Development Policy DP2 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD are also considered relevant in this instance.
- 7.121 As earlier referred within Section 5.0 of this report, the local community initially raised concerns over the proposed access to the site. However, it is important to note that such concerns were raised in the absence of confirmation from the Highways Agency relating to the proposed A1 upgrade works. Issues were also raised in relation to access on private land and also the conflict of HGVs with “*normal motorists*” on the local highway network. The traffic associated with the proposed development would gain both access to, and egress from the site, by means of a new junction onto Low Street, to the north of Broad Close Cottages before travelling onto the new Local Access Road (LAR) negating any traffic along Low Street beside the properties of Glebe Farm & Cottages, Fleetham Lodge, Melton House, Oak Tree House and Warren House or passing through the village of Kirby Fleetham.
- 7.122 On 7<sup>th</sup> May 2013 the Highways Agency confirmed that “*the mainline design (A1(M)) has been approved and the side road/ local access road (LAR) are still at the design stage*”. It was also confirmed that as part of the LAR works package, there would be a new junction with Low Street. It was confirmed that a Road Safety Audit (RSA) would be required of the new junction “*with the design conditioned to the planning permission but again stressed that this may be abortive work*” for the applicant company. The Highway Authority confirmed that a Stage 1 RSA would also be required for access junction directly from the application site onto Low Street. The Highways Agency confirmed that a Section 278 (S278) Agreement (of the Highways Act 1980) would also be required for the proposed road works if the applicant company decided not to wait for the proposed A1(M) upgrade. However, the applicant company confirmed that they “*would be happy to wait until October/ November to await the outcome of the LAR design approval*” as the applicant company



would prefer that the Highways Agency undertook the improvements to the junction at Low Street and the A1(M).

- 7.123 However, during the processing of this application, the upgrading of the A1 to motorway status has taken place and the Local Access Road constructed.
- 7.124 Highways England has, therefore, returned no objections against the proposed development and confirm their view that the proposed upgrade of the A1(T), “*will provide an appropriate connection between Low Road and the new Local Access Road*”.
- 7.125 The Highway Authority has set out a number of highways-related conditions that have been recommended could be attached to any planning permission. The nature of these conditions includes a prohibition on any mineral-loaded vehicles leaving the site until such time as the Local Access Road (LAR) is opened and in use as well as making the routing of HGVs to the LAR a part of a S106 Legal Agreement.
- 7.126 The Highway Authority also provided suggested wording for a ‘*Grampian*’ condition, which would be dependent upon the construction and completion of the Local Access Road and the improvements to Low Street being completed by the applicant company. In particular, the proposed wording of the ‘*Grampian*’ condition states that “*No sand and gravel shall be removed from the site area shown on drawing NT10306/12/figure 3 by road until the local access road (LAR) is constructed connecting to Low street allowing access to the A1 up grade as shown on Highway Agency plans dated 3rd April 2013 is completed and open to the public*”.
- 7.127 The response also included a request that a S106 Legal Agreement be put in place to control the routing of HGVs. It also set out the matters to be included within the proposed S106 Legal Agreement, which should comprise a *Traffic Management Plan* to restrict HGV vehicle operation and movements to the site via the Local Access Road and the improved Low Street to the application site. Upon review it is considered an acceptable approach, should Members be minded to grant planning permission, that it be subject to a S106 Legal Agreement, which would include a schedule to secure the routing of HGV vehicles to and from the quarry operations. The schedule would take the form of a covenant to ensure that HGVs that would travel to and from the application site follow a specific route which is clearly indicated on an appropriately illustrated plan.
- 7.128 It is also important to note that any permission would also be subject to provisions under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended), which as the agent has noted in previous correspondence, may also contribute to maintenance of the grass verge through a *commuted sum*.

- 7.129 It would also be considered prudent to ensure the S106 Legal Agreement would include the need to provide appropriately located and maintained signage to guide drivers when exiting the site.
- 7.130 A further response from the Highway Authority provided a replacement set of specific conditions that the Highway Authority recommended be attached to any planning permission. These conditions have been reviewed as part of this assessment and are considered acceptable in order to help mitigate potential effects upon the local highway network resulting from the proposed development.
- 7.131 The application proposals have been scrutinised by the relevant experts, both the Highway Authority and Highways England, and it is noted that no objections have been returned against the proposed development from either of these acknowledged experts in their field. With the upgrading of the A1 to motorway status having now taken place and the Local Access Road constructed, there continues to be no objections raised against the proposed development in this specific respect.
- 7.132 Taking into consideration the proposed development is capable of being controlled by appropriately worded planning conditions and vehicle routing could be controlled through the mechanism of a Section 106 Legal Agreement, it is considered that the vehicular movements associated with the proposed development, including the transport links to move the mineral to market are considered acceptable. The traffic proposals would therefore be in accordance with criterion (h) of 'saved' Policy 4/1 and 'saved' Policy 4/13 of the NYMLP; Policy CP3 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policy CP1 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; Development Policy DP2 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.133 Paragraph 32 of the NPPF considers transport in relation to new development and states that "*all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment*" and, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aims and objectives in this respect.

*Hydrological and hydrogeological impacts*

- 7.134 The assessment of the effects of the proposed development in respect of the water environment, including potential adverse impacts upon both ground and surface waters, is provided within the applicant company's Environmental Statement (Chapter 9 refers) which accompanies the planning application. It has confirmed that the sand and gravel that is proposed to be extracted is, for the most part, situated beneath the water-table and therefore *de-watering* is

proposed to be undertaken to allow dry working of the mineral. An effect of changing groundwater levels and flow direction has been found to potentially impact upon the land to the north-west of the area that has been referred to as 'Killerby West' as a result of dewatering. While the assessment has found this impact to be 'adverse', it has further found it to be of 'local' significance, geographically, and both 'short-term' and 'reversible', resulting in a 'minor' assessed effect. This is similarly the case in respect of effects upon Fiddale Beck, the land to the south-east of the area known as 'Killerby South' and an associated minor watercourse within that area. The exception to the assessment's conclusions of 'minor' significance of effects in respect of hydrology and hydrogeology is that of the River Swale where an impact of 'moderate' significance has been concluded.

- 7.135 The findings of the environmental impact assessment on this specific issue have maintained that "*this would not result in significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area and no long-term impacts to groundwater flow and direction are predicted after the restoration of the quarry*". The resultant impact assessment deemed these effects to be *minor negative* impacts during the short- to medium- term. With regard to the long-term perspective, it is considered that opportunities exist for the improvement of water quality, for example, through the creation of habitats such as reed bed.
- 7.136 In terms of flood risk, the effects of the potential for an increase in flood risk both to, and from, the site during extraction has been assessed. Whilst acknowledging the application site to be situated "*predominantly on the floodplain of the River Swale*", the assessed impacts have been categorised as being of either 'negligible' or 'minor' significance with the exception of 'moderate' significance in the event of a pollution incident during a flood without appropriate mitigation. The [Flood Risk Assessment](#) that has informed the Environmental Statement has further confirmed that there would be "*no reduction in storm water storage during operations or post-restoration, therefore there would be no increase in the flood risk*". The applicant company does not propose to remove the current flood defences *in situ* to the north of the area referred to as 'Killerby East'. The applicant company has also clarified within its submitted Environmental Statement that upon completion of the proposed restoration, "*when the existing flood protection bund would be breached, the area of open water in Killerby East would provide further flood storage on site*".
- 7.137 In acknowledging the national significance, geographically, of ecological designations, a further assessment has covered the potential for effects upon the [Swale Lakes SSSI](#) (some 500 metres to the north-east of the area referred to as 'Killerby West'. However, by dint of its hydraulic separation from the proposed site, the assessment has concluded there to be no impacts arising.

- 7.138 With respect to groundwater quality, the impacts, *inter alia*, upon private water supplies and licensed abstractions have been assessed and that found no impacts would arise in these specific respects. With regard to the potential for impacts upon groundwater quality arising from operational dewatering of the site, the assessment concluded, for the most part, to be of ‘*minor*’ significance with the exception of that in respect of an event of accidental spillage of fluids from plant and machinery. In such a circumstance, a ‘*moderate*’ significance has been found.
- 7.139 The assessment of possible effects upon surface water quality in respect of potential spillage of contaminants directly into a watercourse has been assessed as being of ‘*moderate*’ significance and the surface water discharge into the river or Fiddale Beck, while an ‘*adverse*’ impact, its significance has been assessed as being ‘*minor*’ once mitigated through the use of settlement lagoons (as explained in the paragraphs that follow).
- 7.140 With respect to ensuring that any effects of the proposed development upon hydrology and/or hydrogeology are appropriately mitigated, the applicant company’s proposed measures include a high level of plant maintenance that would minimise any risk of pollution, such as the accidental loss of fluid from fixed or mobile plant and the operation of the quarry in strict accord with an ‘*Environment Management System*’. A 200 metre diameter area has also been stated as being the maximum area of any dewatering to be undertaken at any point in time for the duration of the proposed development. The Environmental Statement explains that following mitigation, such as the pumping of dewatering discharge water to on-site lagoons where settlement will occur prior to discharge and the regulated discharge of water from the settlement lagoon to compensate for reduction in the groundwater base flow. The assessment undertaken has confirmed that the “*possible reduction in baseflow to the Fiddale Beck can be compensated through discharge from the settlement lagoons to the watercourse. The discharge [would] be regulated to ensure the total flow does not exceed the capacity of the watercourse*”. Furthermore, so as to mitigate against the assessed impacts of ‘*moderate*’ significance in respect of the River Swale, the applicant company has proposed the placement of low conductivity material along working faces adjacent to the river that would serve to reduce groundwater flow into the site and outflow to the river. Therefore, de-watering would not result in significant adverse impacts and long-term alterations to groundwater flow would not be anticipated following restoration.
- 7.141 ‘*Saved*’ Policy 4/10 of the NYMLP is relevant in the consideration of the hydrological/hydrogeological issues such as the protection of water resources when considering new development proposals. The policy states that such proposals “*will only be permitted where they would not have an unacceptable impact on surface or groundwater resources*”. Other relevant *Development Plan* policies against which to assess the proposed development

comprise: Policies CP2, CP3 and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policies CP1 and CP2 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; and Development Policies DP2, DP32, DP33 and DP43 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

- 7.142 Responses from the local community raised a number of hydrological / hydrogeological issues in terms of flood risk, impacts upon the water table, *“which could damage the quality of surrounding agricultural land”*.
- 7.143 The submissions made by the applicant company during the course of the processing of this application have all been scrutinised by the relevant experts including those Officers of the Yorkshire Water Services Limited, the Lead Local Flood Authority, the Swale and Ure Internal Drainage Board, the District Council and the Environment Agency within their respective jurisdictions (Section 4.0 of this report refers).
- 7.144 The Environment Agency has responded setting out a number of recommended conditions in relation to flood risk and groundwater and these have been outlined in Section 4.0 of this report. The applicant company has been advised that contact should be made with the Agency to discuss future requirements for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations.
- 7.145 The Swale & Ure Internal Drainage Board initially responded identifying the waterbodies affecting the application site and confirmed that their consent would be required for any structures affecting the relevant watercourses. Furthermore, the Land Drainage Act (1994) gives the IDB permissive powers to carry out its functions and the Board confirmed its understanding that it is unlikely the Board will continue to maintain the watercourses within the site boundary until full restoration works have concluded. However, the Board would *“continue to enforce the LDA and Byelaws during execution of the works to ensure compliance”*.
- 7.146 Yorkshire Water Services Ltd identified the need to take into account the presence of a third water main crossing the application site, falling within Phase 1 of the proposed works. Importantly, the response confirmed that the water main *“can remain in place throughout the quarry operations if it is decided to be the most appropriate option”*. The response confirms that the legislation this is controlled through is Schedule 14 of the Water Industry Act (1991) and would not require a planning condition. However, notwithstanding *“the phasing of development, subsequent extraction and restoration scheme should all take into account the presence of this water main as Yorkshire Water has the option to maintain the position of the infrastructure”*.
- 7.147 In order to satisfy the requirements of Yorkshire Water Services Limited, a condition requiring there to be no excavation within 5 metres of any water main

and that it should be “*protected from potential damage from machinery and excavations if it is to remain in its current position*” was recommended.

- 7.148 As earlier referred within Section 2.0 of this report, parts of the application site fall within delineated Flood Zones 2 and 3. The northern part of the site, both south and north of the River Swale is within Flood Zone 3 and forms part of the functional floodplain where water must be allowed to flow or be stored and other parts of the application site, to the east and in and around Killerby Hall fall within Flood Zone 2. However, in relation to flood risk, the Environment Agency, the relevant and acknowledged experts in this field, raise no objection against the proposed development and, as a consequence, notwithstanding the matters raised by those in making representations, no reasonable ground is considered to exist upon which to refuse to grant planning permission specifically upon this particular material consideration alone.
- 7.149 While the majority of the application site overlies a *Principal Aquifer* with a smaller proportion lying above a *Secondary Aquifer*, the Environment Agency acknowledge that potentially the proposed development, without appropriate and adequate mitigation, could adversely affect groundwater including physical disturbance of the aquifer and while the proposed site lies outwith any *Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZ)*; the north eastern part of the application site, which falls within former Ellerton Quarry workings lies adjacent to a Zone 3 (total catchment) SPZ.
- 7.150 In relation to groundwater therefore, the Environment Agency advised the applicant company that if the proposed development is considered to present a hazard to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions then the applicant company must provide an acceptable *Hydrological Risk Assessment*. In response during the course of the processing of the application, further submissions have been made to address the Agency’s concerns and the Agency is satisfied these risks can be managed and has raised no objections to the development subject to the imposition of any recommended conditions.
- 7.151 Furthermore, as part of the applicant company’s proposals in mitigation, a comprehensive groundwater monitoring regime for the site has been offered up since the original submission of the application (Section 9.0 of this report below refers).
- 7.152 Based on the responses of those consulted in respect of this application to their satisfaction and taking into account that the proposed development is capable of being acceptable in land use planning terms (provided appropriate and suitable planning conditions are imposed upon any permission to ensure that groundwater can be adequately safeguarded during the proposed operations (should planning permission be forthcoming), it is considered that the development does not give rise to any conflict with ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/10 of the NYMLP; Policies CP2, CP3 and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan;

Policies CP1 and CP21 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; Development Policies DP2, DP32, DP33 and DP43 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.153 Section 10 of the NPPF sets out the national planning policy stance on flooding and, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aims and objectives in this respect.

*Access and recreation*

- 7.154 The applicant company explains that the restoration scheme would improve public access *"by including potential public access corridors and new public access points around the site. The proposals would aim to provide a riverside public access bridleway corridor which would contribute to the potential for a link between Catterick and Kirkby Fleetham"*. Furthermore, recreational after-use, which could be in the form of fishing, has been proposed by the applicant company to be the focus of the 'south lake'.
- 7.155 The accompanying Environmental Statement has confirmed that during the proposed operational phases, the existing *"public footpath that runs through the site between Killerby Hall and Broadclose Farm would be diverted westwards along the northern boundary of Killerby South, along the west side of the central processing area on an existing track and then eastwards along the Broadclose Farm access road where it re-joins its original route"*. It goes on to state that additional temporary access paths and bridleways would be established to provide *"a circular route around the perimeter of Killerby East along the riverside and to parts of Killerby South, throughout the operation of the site, to maintain public access and some new permanent new routes shown would be created during the works"* and has confirmed that the total length of the new bridleways created would be approximately 8.8km.
- 7.156 The assessment of potential impacts upon access and recreational assets within the Environmental Statement has concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts on any of the other PRowWs within the study area, *"or on the wider recreational activities of the local area"*. It also concludes that *"In the longer term there would be substantial beneficial effects on the recreation and amenity use of the area from the provision of improved access and from the recreational use of the restored site area"*.
- 7.157 'Saved' Policy 4/15 of the NYMLP considers the implications of development upon the PRow network, supporting proposals where *"satisfactory provision has been made in the application for protecting the existing right of way or for providing alternative arrangements both during and after working"*. Other Development Plan policies that are considered relevant comprise: policies

CP11, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan; Policies CP1, CP16, CP17 and CP19 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; and Development Policies DP2, DP30, DP32, DP33, DP37 and DP38 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

- 7.158 Those consulted, having expertise in this specific field, include Natural England which confirmed support in terms of access and recreation, for “*the creation of 8.8km of new bridleway*” and the proposed mitigation measures, which aim to “*limit the impact of this proposal on public rights of way and on recreational users of these routes*”.
- 7.159 The County Council’s own in-house adviser on Public Rights of Way issues advised that in terms of baseline, the application site and surrounding area is “*poorly served by public rights of way*”. The response also noted that both the A1(T) road and the River Swale created barriers, which were considered to be difficult for users to cross, particularly horse riders. In particular, a view was expressed that the footpath adjacent to Killerby Hall would be affected by the proposed development, but also pointed out an opportunity that the proposal could present in the creation of new accesses and developing links to the wider PRow network within the area, including the former Ellerton Quarry workings, north of the river. A number of specific recommendations were made that included the standards that should be applied to the creation of new PRow, a new route along the river edge and a new crossing of the River Swale, including equestrian access through the site. It was further reiterated that the existing PRow network within the application site should be protected and kept clear of obstruction “*until such time as any alternative route has been provided and confirmed under an Order made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990*”. The North Yorkshire Local Access Forum has also been consulted by the County Planning Authority and their concerns are also capable of being accommodated within applicant company’s proposals.
- 7.160 In addressing access and recreation considerations, further details, which are considered to be satisfactory, have been submitted by the applicant company during the course of the processing of this application that have identified the potential for the lake within the area referred to as ‘*Killerby South*’ to be used for fishing, “*thus also improving the recreational value of the area*”.
- 7.161 In light of the above information and considering that no objections on the grounds of access and recreation have been returned as well as taking into account that the applicant company is considered to have adequately compensated for the diversion of a PRow and temporary diversions to the existing PRow network, together with the details of the proposed access and recreational routes within the *Draft Restoration Management Plan*; a constituent element of the draft S106 Legal Agreement, it is considered that the application is consistent with the recreational aims of ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/15 of the NYMLP; policies CP11, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local



Plan; policies CP1, CP16, CP17 and CP19 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; and Development Policies DP2, DP30, DP32, DP33, DP37, and DP38 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.162 Paragraph 75 of the NPPF states that “*Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails*” and, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF’s aims and objectives in this respect.

*Impacts upon soil management and agricultural land*

- 7.163 While the environmental impact assessment of the proposed development has identified an ‘*adverse*’ impact arising as a result of the extraction of mineral from the land, that impact has been assessed as being of ‘*low*’ significance by dint of the effect being both ‘*short-term*’ and ‘*reversible*’. With specific respect to land classified as ‘*best & most versatile land*’ (Grades 3a and above), the applicant company has acknowledged the resultant loss of 88.9 hectares of Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land and 48 hectares of Grade 3b, but has stated, in mitigation, that “*progressive restoration will reduce the duration of soil storage*” and “*upon the cessation of mineral extraction, the topsoil and subsoil stripped and stored at the site would be used for restoration, adopting the best practice techniques*” returning 145.6 hectares of land back to agricultural use.
- 7.164 With regard to the potential impacts of the proposed development upon the drainage systems which support the affected agricultural land, the assessment, while acknowledging this to be ‘*adverse*’, has found this to be both ‘*short-term*’ and ‘*reversible*’ and of ‘*low*’ significance.
- 7.165 In mitigation, the proposed measures include the construction of perimeter ditches and silt lagoons with water arising from the de-watering of the site flowing through the lagoons and then being discharged into either the river or the beck; furthermore, the design of the scheme has incorporated measures to cope with storm water flow avoiding elevated levels of surface water run-off either onto, or off, the land and ensuring the quality of water remains unimpeded.
- 7.166 The relevant local *Development Plan* policy context is considered to comprise ‘*saved*’ policies 4/18 and 4/20 of the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan where ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/18, whilst seeking to minimise as far as possible any irreversible loss of agricultural land, seeks to ensure the proposed restoration scheme provides for the best practicable standard of restoration and ‘*saved*’

Policy 4/20 seeks to “bring the restored land up to an approved standard for the specified after-use”.

- 7.167 Those making representations in respect of the proposed development have questioned the justification for the proposals in light of the loss of high quality agricultural land. While the proposals do not affect any land of Grade 1 classification, they do impact upon 88.9 hectares of land classified as Grade 2 and Grade 3a, i.e. ‘best & most versatile’ land together with 48 hectares of Grade 3b agricultural land. However, with the exception of 19 hectares of BMV land, this loss is proposed to be temporary and not all of the land is proposed to be worked at any one point in time. In the determination of this application, this material consideration must be ‘weighed’ within the ‘planning balance’ against the material considerations of the statutory duty of the County Planning Authority to maintain a continued steady supply of mineral to market, together with increased accessibility to the countryside through public amenity access in the form of 8.59 kilometres of new footpaths and the benefits to nature conservation in terms of the bio-diversity enhancements which have been offered up within the restoration proposals of the proposed development; whilst being mindful, at the same time, of sustainable development principles.
- 7.168 The land-use acceptability or otherwise of the proposed development in terms of its effects upon soil management and agriculture are also closely linked to restoration and ‘after-care’ which are explained in more detail below.

#### Restoration and ‘after-care’

- 7.169 While, in this particular proposal put forward by the applicant company, proposes a restoration scheme that prioritises bio-diversity, it nevertheless also includes an element of agricultural restoration. Overall, the restoration land use types are proposed to include wetland in the form of lakes, and marshland, woodland, alder/birch/willow carr, hedgerows, footpaths, bridleways and agricultural land. For the most part, the area referred to as ‘Killerby South’ is proposed to be returned to agricultural after-use; the anticipated return of the ‘best and most versatile’ quality grade of land. Upon restoration, the land proposed to be returned to an agricultural after-use that would amount to 131.6 hectares (at the same time acknowledging an overall loss of 10.6 hectares post-restoration) along with a coverage of 32.6 hectares of restoration to lakes, 18.2 hectares of wet woodland alder/willow carr, 6 hectares of marsh and 7.4 hectares of woodland as well as 4,280 linear metres of hedges interspersed with trees. The restoration proposals, the applicant company explains, have sought to “re-establish the pre-development field boundary pattern of hedgerows and hedgerow trees, together with enhancement of the setting of Killerby Hall”. Recreational after-use, which could be in the form of fishing, has been proposed by the applicant company to be the focus of the ‘south lake’. The ‘west lake’ is proposed to be “an ornamental lake” and the ‘east lake’ a lake for nature conservation purposes.

Due to the proposed site's location within '[Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone](#)' for RAF Leeming, the planting strategies around the 'east lake' and 'south lake' have sought to "*discourage flocking birds and large species that could create a risk to aviation*". These restoration proposals are currently captured within the submitted drawing accompanying the application, the '[Restoration Masterplan](#)' (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016). The applicant company has further explained that the restoration design has sought to retain as much of the existing tree cover as possible. A five-year period of statutorily-imposed 'after-care' is proposed to take place upon each phase of restoration having been completed.

- 7.170 The revised Environmental Statement explained that the findings of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey has justified the proposed design of the restoration scheme, which seeks to retain as much of the existing tree cover on the site as is feasible and that the scheme is so designed as to "*enhance conditions for the regionally important local population of Soprano Pipistrelle bats and for a range of farmland bird species that have suffered national decline*". As part of the restoration, in the eastern part of the application site, the applicant company intends to create "*an irregular shaped lake bordered by retained trees in order to provide an ornithological habitat of county ornithological importance*." It is also important to clarify that the proposed phased restoration would include landscape planting "*to maintain key green corridors within and around the site throughout the operational period, together with new wetlands to enhance the ecological value of the river corridor*". In addition, it has recognised that the restoration of the site to wetland would further extend and enhance the wetland habitats within the Swale Valley, making reference to the '[Swale Lakes SSSI](#)', which is protected for its ornithological value. It is acknowledged that a network of wildlife corridors is proposed to be created that would link the restored site to surrounding areas, and "*thus creating linkages with surrounding habitats*".
- 7.171 It is further acknowledged that, from a recreational perspective, the applicant company has identified the potential for the lake in '*Killerby South*' to be used for fishing, "*thus also improving the recreational value of the area*" and the restored site would improve public access within the area by "*including potential public access corridors and new public access points around the site*" as well as riverside public access bridleway corridor which could contribute to the potential for a link between Catterick and Kirkby Fleetham.
- 7.172 A statutorily imposed five-year aftercare period would apply to the restored site were planning permission to be forthcoming and in light of the proposed progressive working on a phased basis, this is similarly the case in respect of the restoration of the site i.e. progressive and, therefore, the '*aftercare*' would also be phased, starting as phases within the site have been restored. The applicant company is of the view that due to this progressive aftercare approach, "*much of the site would receive more than 5 years aftercare*".

- 7.173 The relevant policy section on restoration and ‘*after-care*’ within the NYMLP sets out that ‘*restoration should aim to work towards the longer term enhancement of the environment and local amenity and should ensure the best possible quality restoration of land*’.
- 7.174 Criterion (f) of ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/1 of the NYMLP states that the “*Mineral Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that, where appropriate... the proposals and programme for restoration are acceptable and would allow a high standard of restoration to be achieved*”. Criterion (g) of ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/1 of the NYMLP states that there is a need to be satisfied that, where appropriate, a high standard of aftercare and management of the land in question can be achieved.
- 7.175 ‘*Saved*’ Policy 4/18 of the NYMLP is engaged in this particular instance given the proposed restoration to agricultural land (in part), stating where agriculture is the intended primary afteruse, “*the proposed restoration scheme should provide for the best practicable standard of restoration. Such restoration schemes should, where possible, include landscape, conservation or amenity proposals provided that these do not result in the irreversible loss of best and most versatile land*”.
- 7.176 ‘*Saved*’ Policy 4/20 of the NYMLP relates to the ‘*after-care*’ of sites and states that “*Planning permissions which are subject to conditions requiring restoration to agriculture, forestry or amenity (including nature conservation) will additionally be subject to an aftercare requirement seeking to bring the restored land up to an approved standard for the specified after-use*”.
- 7.177 Policies CP3, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan, Policies CP1, CP16, and CP17 of the Hambleton Core Strategy and Development Policies DP30, DP31 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD are also considered relevant to the assessment of this application.
- 7.178 While representations made in respect of the proposed development have questioned the proposals relating to the site’s restoration and the restoration proposals insofar as they have the potential to affect interests at the MoD’s RAF Leeming, it is noted that no objections have been returned from those with whom the County Planning Authority has consulted in this particular instance in relation to either the restoration proposals for the site or the proposed duration of the ‘*aftercare*’ of the restored site and that the proposals are informed by a comprehensive knowledge of the underlying geology which to a large degree is determinant in the options for restoration as well as being accompanied by a proposed *Bird Management Strategy* to manage risk associated with attracting flocking birds to the restored lake areas.

- 7.179 Natural England expressed a view that the proposed restoration would create an area of diverse habitats capable of underpinning existing species in the area, but cautioned the need to be flexible with regard to the restoration scheme to enable “*habitat creation and restoration to be able to respond to unforeseen opportunities*”. Satisfaction with the proposed restoration scheme was therefore confirmed and in terms of *aftercare*, Natural England advised that the control of invasive plant species should be specifically referenced within the aims of the *aftercare* scheme.
- 7.180 The County Council’s own in-house adviser on matters of ecology expressed concern that the proposed restoration did not include a suitable level of biodiversity enhancement. However, in responding to the most recent consultation, whilst acknowledging concerns existed with regards the level of biodiversity value that could be achieved from the proposed restoration and the need for a long-term management across the whole of the restored site (including the consideration of how the “*multiple end uses*” could work cohesively), they were not concerns that amount to an objection to the proposed development and, instead, were capable of being satisfied by the use of appropriately worded planning conditions should planning permission be forthcoming.
- 7.181 In March 2014, the Agent notified the County Planning Authority of amendments to the proposed *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.8 Rev C dated April 2013 which, indicated various amendments including the extent of undisturbed woodland, and shingle banks along the River Swale; the introduction of alder willow carr in place of reeds; and not reinstating hedgerows around the southern proposed lake in order to “*maintain the openness*” of this part of the application site. In May 2015, the applicant company submitted a further revised *Restoration Masterplan* drwg no. NT10306/12/Figure 3.8 Rev D dated March 2015. The applicant has confirmed (27<sup>th</sup> March 2015) that the changes related to the areas and types of vegetation cover. As a result of further discussions, the *Restoration Masterplan* has been revised and the most recent iteration is revision H (dated July 2016).
- 7.182 Concerns were also raised from the local community in relation to the proposed lake adjacent to the River Swale, raising the potential for erosion on the banks of the River Swale to potentially result in the banks breaking, with the resultant water flooding the proposed lake and ultimately flooding Killerby Hall. It is therefore suggested that this part of the site is actually restored to agricultural land instead.
- 7.183 As earlier referred, subsequent correspondence from the agent responded to this concern stating that flood bank defences to the River Swale would be maintained and the Environment Agency has identified “*the potential of*

*Killerby East Lake to contribute to flood water storage and flood alleviation of areas downstream of the site and would lessen the risk to Kirkby Hall”.*

- 7.184 Specifically in relation to the safeguards for the nearby RAF Leeming, in response to consultation, the Ministry of Defence made a number of suggested alterations to the proposed *Bird Management Plan* and advised it should be controlled through a S106 Legal Agreement. As noted in section 5.0 of this Committee Report, the Agent confirms that the applicant company has offered to provide a S106 Legal Agreement relating to the long-term management of the wetland margins within the application site. The Agent has also confirmed that restoration of the application site is restricted in part due to issues raised during consultation from the MOD. Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Legal Agreement, therefore, sets out the details of the proposed *Bird Management Plan*.
- 7.185 The proposed *Bird Management Plan* shall include the following overarching aims and objectives:
- management operations to deter flocking birds of certain identified species;
  - management of grasslands to reduce numbers of target species of birds;
  - monitoring of the application site during the Post Extraction Period;
  - a range of techniques for deterring the numbers of target species including but not limited to habitat management, potable acoustic deterrents, bird scarers, egg oiling and culling operations; and
  - access at specified times for the purposes of verifying bird population.
- 7.186 As confirmed in earlier correspondence from the Agent and discussed in Section 5.0 of this Committee Report, it is the applicant company’s intention that the long term management of the site would commence in the phase it applies to, after the 5 year *aftercare* period is complete, “*since the management is not for establishment of vegetation but to prevent birdstrike risk*”.
- 7.187 Upon review, it is important to note that the proposed *Bird Management Plan*, as set out in the proposed S106 Legal Agreement, has been considered by the County Planning Authority’s relevant specialists who have raised no objections to the proposed strategy. No objections have been received from Natural England to the proposed restoration scheme. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed *Bird Management Plan* contained within the draft Section 106 Legal Agreement would provide a satisfactory mechanism in which to allow the required restoration to be achieved.
- 7.188 Notwithstanding concerns raised in relation to the levels of ecological value of the proposed restoration scheme, it is considered that the applicant company has responded to such requests where feasible and it is considered that the principle of the proposed restoration programme would not conflict with the aims of national and local planning policy. However, it is considered prudent

that the S106 Legal Agreement provides for restoration and the provision of a *Detailed Restoration and Management Plan* (DRMP). The preparation of this DRMP should be undertaken in consultation with in-house experts to help address outstanding issues relating to landscape and ecology raised during consultation. The replacement of the loss of hedgerows on site would also need to be addressed.

- 7.189 For clarification purposes, details of the completed restoration scheme for the application site, encompassing the completed restoration for the existing quarry site have been set out on the revised *'Restoration Masterplan'* (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 3.8 Rev H, dated 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016). However, it is important to note that depending on the details of the DRMP, further amendments may be required to the *Restoration Masterplan*.
- 7.190 Taking the above into account in the overall assessment of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed restoration and *'after-care'* on the site can be achieved in accordance with criterion (f) and (g) of *'saved'* Policy 4/1, *'saved'* Policy 4/18 and *'saved'* Policy 4/20 of the NYMLP; Policies CP3, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan, Policies CP1, CP16, and CP17 of the Hambleton Core Strategy; Development Policies DP30, DP31 and DP33 of the Hambleton Development Policies DPD.

*Other material considerations*

- 7.191 Paragraph 144 of the NPPF requires the restoration and aftercare of minerals-related developments at the earliest opportunity. The NPPG also makes reference to biodiversity and green infrastructure, stating that planning authorities should *"consider the opportunities that individual development proposals may provide to enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity in the wider area"* and, therefore, taking into consideration the proposals as put forward, they are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aims and objectives in this respect.

*Socio-economic impacts*

- 7.192 The applicant company's Environmental Statement has stated that the proposed mineral extraction operations would result in the temporary loss of approximately 136.9 hectares of agricultural land of which approximately 83.7 hectares is classified as *'best and most versatile'* (BMV) agricultural land.
- 7.193 The Environmental Statement also confirmed *"that quarry operations would be conducted in such a way to prevent, minimise or control any impact to the agricultural drainage of field outside the extraction area within the site and adjacent fields"* and that circa 145.6ha of the land both inside and outside the earmarked extraction boundary would be returned to agricultural land as part of the restoration scheme.

- 7.194 Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Hambleton Core Strategy are considered relevant in the assessment of this application due to their economic threads. This assessment will first consider the issue surrounding the loss of agricultural land as a result of the proposed development.
- 7.195 Natural England responded to the consultation and welcomed the planned return of much of the site to agricultural land, as shown on the initial *Restoration Masterplan*.
- 7.196 The County Council's landscape adviser also responded to consultation, seeking clarification that the proposed restoration scheme does not clarify which areas of land "*represent the restoration of Grade 2 agricultural land, or how the restored character will reflect the nature of the replaced soils*".
- 7.197 The value of such land to the agricultural economy is recognised, and also the stance of national policy to avoid the loss of high grade land. However, as discussed above, it is considered that the proposed development is a sustainable development, which will maintain the supply of sand and gravel to the market place and help sustain the construction trade. Furthermore, the proposals anticipate the continued direct employment of thirteen people in the minerals industry as well as those associated with the hauling of the mineral and the provision of supplies to the site. The economic benefits of such should be given weight in the determination of this application.
- 7.198 Therefore, the other aspect to consider in this assessment is the predicted economic benefits associated with the proposed development. Firstly, the applicant company states that the proposed development would support in advance of twenty direct jobs plus indirect employment effects in terms of "*hauliers and many suppliers*".
- 7.199 As earlier referred, there is a recognition that in order to maintain a long-term supply of sand and gravel for the marketplace that sites, which contain '*new reserves*' need to be given due consideration, especially if they fall within an 'Area of Search'. Significant weight is attached to the wider economic benefits that the proposed development will bring, both directly with the creation of immediate jobs and indirectly resulting from the supply of the extracted and processed sand and gravel to the market place.
- 7.200 While acknowledging Paragraph 112 of the NPPF to be of relevance to this application due to the presence of agricultural land within the application site stating that "*Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality*", Section 13 of the NPPF considers facilitating the sustainable use of minerals. Paragraphs 142 to 149 set out



national planning policy with respect to “*facilitating the sustainable use of minerals*” through effective plan making and the determination of planning applications. This includes reference to the economic importance of minerals to the country and emphasises that “*since minerals are a finite resource and can only be worked where they are found it is important to make the best use of them to secure their long-term conservation*”.

- 7.201 It is, therefore, considered that whilst the loss of such high quality agricultural land is not desirable, as stated in the NPPF, the economic benefits of the proposed development would render the proposed loss acceptable in this case and therefore not conflicting with the NPPF. The economic importance of minerals to the country is also recognised within the NPPF. It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with the NPPF and the principles of ‘*saved*’ Policy 4/18 of the NYMLP and policies CP1 and CP3 of the Hambleton Core Strategy.

#### Cumulative impacts

- 7.202 The applicant company acknowledges within its submitted Environmental Statement that “*extensive mineral working has been undertaken along the Swale valley, with historically worked sites, currently active sites and future proposed sites lying within a 5km radius of the proposed Killerby site, including Ellerton quarry immediately to the north*” resulting in a mosaic of wetland and woodland habitats along the river. The assessment has concluded that the loss of low ecological value agricultural has resulted in positive cumulative impacts through the enhancement of biodiversity in the locality of the application site and that the development as proposed would not therefore result in negative, significant and/or materially adverse consequences cumulatively.
- 7.203 In terms of potential cumulative effects, each of the topics considered within the Environmental Statement have been considered against the relevant cumulative effects (where it is feasible to do so) of the existing quarries namely Kiplin Hall, Scorton and Ellerton Quarries immediately to the north of the site. It is noted that Kiplin Hall Quarry is no longer productive and Scorton Quarry, which is situated circa  $\frac{3}{4}$  km to the north-west of the application site is expected to cease production by 2017/18 before any development were to commence in the Killerby site should planning permission to be forthcoming. The applicant company confirmed within its Environmental Statement at the time of its submission in 2010 that notwithstanding Ellerton Quarry being operational “*on a campaign basis*”, it would be predominantly screened from the Killerby site “*by riverside vegetation and landform*”. The applicant company also confirmed that production would not occur from both Ellerton and Killerby simultaneously. It is also considered that after four years of operations commencing, the reserves within Ellerton Quarry would be substantially

*‘worked out’ and restored “so the opportunity for cumulative effects with Killerby is very restricted”.*

- 7.204 Criterion (i) of ‘saved’ Policy 4/1 of the NYMLP requires the County Planning Authority to be satisfied that, where appropriate, any cumulative impact on the local area resulting from the proposal is acceptable. The NPPF is also relevant to this assessment when considering potential cumulative impacts.
- 7.205 In responding to consultation, the County Council’s in-house adviser on landscape matters was of the opinion that there would be “*significant cumulative impact of mineral extraction on the local landscape*” and pointed out that the applicant company had not provided strategic method to address this; further, that the cumulative impacts on the relevant landscape character also in their opinion had not been assessed within the ES. However, when viewed on balance and being mindful of reasonableness, acknowledging that there can exist levels of expectation in respect of quality and/or thoroughness into which an applicant would be expected to demonstrate certain elements within its submissions accompanying planning applications, it is considered nevertheless, in this particular instance, that the issues specifically relating to the proposed development’s potential cumulative effects have been addressed sufficiently satisfactorily in relation to the assessment of landscape and visual effects.
- 7.206 Taking into consideration the duration that the existing quarries to the north of the application site have been in operation within this location, it is acknowledged that a degree of cumulative impact within the area in terms of the time the operations have been and are proposed to occur within this location. These impacts, however, are weighed against both the need for the mineral and the positive biodiversity outcomes achievable upon and beyond restoration.
- 7.207 The County Planning Authority, as part of its work on the emerging Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plan published its ‘[Sustainability Appraisal – Assessment of Sites](#)’ document at ‘Preferred Options’ stage in which the following text specifically in respect of the Killerby site can be found which further supports the assessment of the potential cumulative effects of the proposed development:  
*“This area represents further quarrying in the Swale corridor in addition to existing and past quarries at Ellerton, Kiplin Hall and Scorton. Negative cumulative impacts are considered unlikely to be significant if appropriate mitigation is implemented. Potential cumulative benefits for biodiversity exist provided that restoration schemes are designed appropriately and any measures for biodiversity can be secured as part of the planning process. It is however noted that not all of the site is within the control of the operator so there is some uncertainty as to whether ecological benefits can be realised as part of the restoration scheme (biodiversity restoration is limited to a lake with*

*no surrounding land and MoD restrictions also limit the type of scheme that could be put in place)... In summary, in the short term negative impacts are anticipated associated with the loss of habitats and disturbance to a range of species. This disturbance continues into the medium term. Impacts in the long term depend on the ability to secure a high quality restoration and management. Opportunities exist to improve the habitat networks through the creation of high quality priority habitats.”*

- 7.208 In light of the above, it is considered to be the case that any potential negative cumulative effects have been appropriately assessed as being limited in their significance. It is considered, therefore, based on the available information that the application does not conflict with the aims of ‘saved’ Policy 4/1(I) of the NYMLP.

Other material considerations

- 7.209 Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that *“to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account”*.
- 7.210 Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that in granting permission for mineral development the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality should be taken into account.

Other matters

- 7.211 A below-ground gas pipeline runs in a east-west alignment through the application site (including some of the planned phased working areas) as shown on the drawing accompanying the application, ‘*Topographical Survey*’ (drwg no. NT10306/12/fig 2 rev A, dated March 2015). The applicant company has confirmed within its revised Environmental Statement (March 2015) that consultation would be undertaken with the gas distributor to remove the gas pipeline in advance of working. The relevant utility undertaker has been consulted by the County Planning Authority and no objection to the proposed development has been offered in response. Each statutory undertaker takes benefit from either statutory powers or direct agreements with relevant landowners should the need arise to seek alternative alignments for their respective assets. The legislation that is relevant depends upon the nature of any agreement in place, but would be expected to be covered by any of the following:
- the *Mines (Working Facilities and Support) Act 1923* (known as the ‘*Mining Code*’);
  - the *Railway Clauses Consolidation Act 1845*; or,
  - the *Pipelines Act 1962*.

- 7.212 The applicant company's agent, in a letter dated [15<sup>th</sup> March 2017](#), has explained that utility companies "*either have to move their apparatus or pay compensation to the mineral extraction company and/or mineral owner for any loss caused by minerals being left unworked. This can include loss of profits, cost of protection works, additional working/restoration costs and professional costs. At Killerby the Landowners granted to Northern Gas Board a Deed of Easement in 1972. The Deed includes the provisions of the 1923 Act. The pipeline has a 20 feet width corridor and a further 10 feet either side for an access strip. Schedule 4 clause 2 includes the provisions of the Mining Code. So the gas pipeline is subject to a formal Deed incorporating the Act that provides a legislative mechanism for its retention or removal*". It goes on to explain that "*the normal process for service diversions on mineral sites is for the mineral operator to serve a formal 'notice of approach' to the utility company, following which the company will either serve a "counter notice" requesting the pipeline to remain, subject to a compensation payment or that it is content for it to be removed. This does not necessarily happen when planning permission is granted and a mineral scheme commences, but could be years later as extraction has to be approaching the utility before a Mining Code notice can be served. The timescale therefore depends where the gas main is located. The gas main at Killerby lies within extraction Phases 4 & 5 in the latter phases of the proposed development programme, so notice would not be served for several years*".
- 7.213 As noted earlier and in similar regard to the water mains that are the property of the relevant statutory undertaker, separate legislative provisions apply to instances where their assets are affected by proposed development. The matters are the subject of other legislative provisions and where these exist, national guidance advises that authorities should have regard to this in their determination of applications to avoid duplication and unnecessary conditions imposed upon prospective developers.
- 7.214 Other matters raised within representations to the County Planning Authority include those of concerns with regards to property values; however, it is established in the planning system in this country that considerations taken to be material in the determination of planning application cannot and must not concern themselves with changes to property values; be they negative or indeed positive. Furthermore, in respect of representations with regard to recent property purchases, planning applications are readily publically accessible and, therefore, capable of being known to those with pending property transactions; notwithstanding, such matters are again not ones to which any material weight may be given in the determination of planning applications.
- 7.215 Other matters raised within representations to the County Planning Authority have also included those of concerns with regards to company failure. Again, such matters cannot be considered to be not material in this particular instance

and hold no weight within the '*planning balance*'. Any planning permission, should that be forthcoming, would '*run with the land*' and not, in the circumstance of this specific case, with the proposed operator, the applicant company. Any owner, or other party, with an interest in the surface of the land would, ultimately, be responsible for compliance with any terms of any consent.

- 7.216 Finally, representations have been made to the County Planning Authority with regards the consultation undertaken in respect of this application. The preceding sections of this report have served to both explain and demonstrate that the process that has been undertaken during the handling of this application has been found to be compliant and not found wanting with regards the requisite legislative provisions pertaining to consultation in respect of planning applications of this nature.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 It is considered that the policy support exists for the proposed development and is reasonably argued on the grounds that, having regard to the *Development Plan* as a whole and acknowledging that it is not necessary for proposals to comply with all policies to be found compliant, it accords with the relevant extant policies that comprise the *Development Plan* and national planning policy contained within the NPPF. The proposal constitutes a sustainable quarry development proposal that could help to maintain the long-term supply of sand and gravel to the market place.
- 8.2 Substantial weight should be attached to the fact that the majority of the site falls within an identified '*Area of Search*'. There is no identified quantifiable existing need for the proposed material, however, as discussed within this report, weight needs to be attached to the fact that the County Planning Authority's *Monitoring Report* (2014/2015) recognises the fact that in order to maintain the landbank level above the required seven years in the future, there is the need for new reserves of sand and gravel to be developed "*if environmentally suitable locations can be identified, by extending existing quarry sites and/or opening new quarries*".
- 8.3 Although this proposed development would not constitute an extension to an existing quarry *per se*, it is important to note that Phase 1 of the proposal relates to the processing of sand and gravel extracted from the existing neighbouring Ellerton Quarry, and would therefore constitute a continuation of operations from an existing adjacent quarry. The applicant company recognises the positive traffic implications and this amalgamated operational stance from the applicant company is acknowledged.
- 8.4 Other material considerations that must weighed in the '*planning balance*' have been considered in the preceding section of this report such as impacts

upon the environment and the amenity enjoyed by the local community. These, while acknowledged to be impacts arising from the proposed development and understandably of concern to local residents living near the proposed site, are not considered to be significantly material so as to outweigh the economic benefits of the sustainable development and to be so sufficient as to warrant a determination that the application lies in conflict with the *Development Plan* to such a degree as to justify refusal of the application.

- 8.5 From an amenity perspective, in terms of noise and air quality, it is considered that there are proposed to be sufficient and appropriate safeguards either already in place (by dint of the existing topography within the vicinity of the site) or proposed. For instance, the proposed *Environmental Management Strategy* is considered capable of effectively mitigating any potential impacts upon air quality arising from the proposed development and prevent any unacceptable impacts on residential amenity in accordance with national and local policy.
- 8.6 It is therefore considered that the proposed safeguards, namely the sequence of extraction and the progressive restoration, with the implementation of acoustic barriers in the form of soil bunds, and the absence of undertaking mineral extraction in the extension area on weekends alongside controls on noise limits, would effectively mitigate the noise impact of the proposal.
- 8.7 In terms of the potential for disturbance from dust, satisfactory safeguards could be put in place, such as the fact that the site manager would be “*responsible for the implementation of control measures on site in order to minimise dust nuisance*” and such measures would form part of site’s *Environmental Management Strategy*.
- 8.8 It is considered that the proposed screening that would be phased throughout the operational period of the quarry, could protect the environment and residential receptors from potential landscape and visual impacts.
- 8.9 It is also considered that the potential impact of the proposal upon identified cultural heritage assets and archaeology have been and would continue to be fully assessed in accordance with the guidance set down in respect of heritage assets within the NPPF, and subject to the use of an appropriate planning condition will ensure an accurate record of an findings at the site is kept.
- 8.10 Given the proposed conditions, including those recommended by the Environment Agency, it is considered that the potential impact of the proposed development on the water environment has been fully assessed and it would be unlikely that the proposed land use would have an unacceptable impact upon groundwater, particularly the strategically important aquifer.

- 8.11 In terms of ecology, it is considered that details of the restoration and management of the site could be secured through a S106 Legal Agreement. It is also considered that with such measures in place and with the imposition of suitably worded ecological conditions then the proposed development is in accordance with the relevant national and local planning policy framework.
- 8.12 Notwithstanding that the proposed restoration for the site would only occur following a period of disturbance during the time mineral is being extracted, it is considered an acceptable approach given the proposed use of the site.
- 8.13 The potential transport impacts of the proposal are considered to be acceptable and there is no objection from Highways England or the Highway Authority. It is considered, taking into account the recommended highways conditions, and due to the fact that vehicle routeing is proposed to be controlled by a Section 106 Legal Agreement, then the vehicular movements associated with the proposed development, including the transport links to move the mineral to market are considered acceptable.
- 8.14 In terms of cumulative effects, it is acknowledged that taking into consideration the duration that the existing quarries to the north of the application site have been in operation within this location that, there could be a cumulative impact within the area in terms of the time the operations have been and are proposed to occur within this location; however, the potential cumulative effects have been appropriately assessed and have concluded these as being limited in their significance.
- 8.15 Furthermore, it is also acknowledged that the loss of high quality agricultural land cannot be considered a positive impact arising from the proposed development. However, as stated in national planning policy, the creation of jobs at Killerby Quarry and the wider economic benefits of the proposed development (providing sand and gravel to the construction sector), when weighed in the '*planning balance*' renders the proposed loss acceptable in this particular circumstance. When considering the economic benefits of mining this site and amalgamating the operations of two quarries, which will have associated transportation benefits, it is considered to be an absence of any issues so materially significant as to tip the balance against granting planning permission for the proposed development in this instance.
- 8.16 In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development either accords, or does not give rise to any materially significant conflict with the aims of the relevant '*saved*' policies of the NYMLP, the Richmondshire Core Strategy, the Hambleton Core Strategy, the Hambleton Development Policies DPD and would constitute sustainable development, maintaining the contribution of mineral-related employment and enable the steady supply of mineral to the local economy. Therefore, on balance there are no material

considerations that would warrant the refusal of planning permission in this instance.

*Obligations under the Equality Act 2010*

- 8.17 The County Planning Authority in carrying out its duties must have regard to the obligations placed upon it under the Equality Act 2010 and due regard has, therefore, been had to the requirements of Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) to safeguard against unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act. It also requires public bodies to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. It is considered that the proposed development would not give rise to significant adverse effects upon the communities in the area or socio-economic factors, particularly those with '*protected characteristics*' by virtue that the impacts of the proposal can be mitigated so that they will not have a significant impact on groups with '*protected characteristics*'.

*Obligations under the Human Rights Act 1998*

- 8.18 The Human Rights Act 1998 requires the County Council to take into account the rights of the public under the European Convention on Human Rights and prevents the Council from acting in a manner which is incompatible with those rights. Article 8 of the Convention provides that there shall be respect for an individual's private life and home save for that interference which is in accordance with the law and necessary in a democratic society in the interests of (inter alia) public safety and the economic wellbeing of the country. Article 1 of protocol 1 provides that an individual's peaceful enjoyment of their property shall not be interfered with save as is necessary in the public interest.
- 8.19 Having had due regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, the relevant issues arising from the proposed development have been assessed as the potential effects upon those living within the vicinity of the site namely those affecting the right to the peaceful enjoyment of one's property and the right to respect for private and family life and homes, and considering the limited interference with those rights is in accordance with the law, necessary and in the public interest.

**9.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 Upon considering that the Environmental Statement, including further and other information submitted by the applicant, includes such information as is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the proposed development and which the applicant could be reasonably be required to compile; and,
- 9.2 Having taken into account the environmental information relating to this application, namely the Environmental Statement, including further and other



information submitted by the applicant, and duly made representations about the environmental effects of the proposed development; and,

9.3 Having due regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, the relevant issues arising have been assessed as the potential effects upon those living within the vicinity of the application site, namely those affecting the right to the peaceful enjoyment of one's property and the right to respect for private and family life and homes, and considering that the limited interference with those rights is in accordance with the law, necessary and in the public interest; and,

9.4 For the following reasons:

- i. the proposed development is considered to accord with 'saved' policies 4/1, 4/6A, 4/10, 4/13, 4/14, 4/15, 4/16, 4/18, 4/20 and 5/1 of the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (1997);
- ii. the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any conflict with 'saved' policies 3/2, 3/3 or 3/4 of the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (1997);
- iii. the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any conflict with the aims and objectives of policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP11, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014);
- iv. the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any conflict with the aims and objectives of policies CP1, CP16, CP17, CP19, CP21 of the Hambleton District Council Core Strategy (2007);
- v. the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any conflict with the aims and objectives of Development Policies DP1, DP2, DP28, DP29, DP30, DP31, DP32, DP33, DP37, DP38, DP43 and DP44 of the Hambleton Development Policies Development Plan Document;
- vi. the proposed development is considered to be consistent with the objectives and policies pertaining to minerals-related development proposals as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) as well as being consistent with the advice and best practice as conveyed within the National Planning Practice Guidance (2014);
- vii. the proposed development is considered acceptable in land use planning terms taking into consideration:
  - a. the impacts of the proposed development in relation to vibration and air quality are capable of being effectively mitigated;
  - b. subject to adequate controls over noise emissions, the proposed development is considered unlikely to lead to an unacceptable detrimental effect upon the amenities of the occupants of nearby residential properties;
  - c. the visual and landscape impact of the proposed development can be mitigated through the proposed S106 Legal Agreement;
  - d. the assessed effects upon interests of nature conservation, ecology and habitat protection are capable of being effectively mitigated and controlled by condition as well as being capable of being enhanced through the proposed S106 Legal Agreement;

- e. any impacts upon assets of historic and/or archaeological interest are capable of being adequately mitigate through the submission of appropriate schemes;
  - f. existing highway network is capable of handling the volume of traffic generated by the proposed development
  - g. the assessed effects in terms of hydrology and hydrogeology have not given rise to impacts of any material significance;
  - h. the opportunities for enhanced recreation benefits and public access;
  - i. the continued employment opportunities within the minerals industry in the local area; and,
  - j. the absence of any unacceptable cumulative impacts arising.
- viii. the imposition of appropriate and suitably worded planning conditions are considered to provide sufficient safeguards against any unacceptable impacts upon the amenities of both the environment and the local community, through controls relating to both the operational and restoration/‘after-care’ phases of the proposed development

it is recommended that, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement controlling the long-term restoration and management, ecological management and appropriate lorry routeing, and subject to the signing of a Section 278 Agreement for proposed works to be carried out on the highway, **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED** for the purposes for the extraction and processing of sand and gravel including the construction of a site access, conveyors, bridges, associated plant and machinery with restoration to agriculture, nature conservation and wetland at Killerby subject to the conditions below

Conditions:

Time Limit

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within six years of the date of this permission. Written notification of the date of commencement of soil-stripping and mineral extraction shall be provided to the County Planning Authority within seven days from commencement of that soil stripping and mineral extraction.

*REASON: To allow for the sequence of mineral extraction from each phase and in accordance with the provisions of Section 91(1)(b) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.*

Definition of Development

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the application details dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010, including those contained in the Environmental Statement and appendices, as amended, including:

- additional/further information received between May and October 2014 comprising:
  - further archaeological investigation, specifically an ‘Archaeological Evaluation of Peat Deposit, Killerby Prospect, North Yorkshire’ (October 2012);
  - a *Transport Statement* (May 2014);

- revised Transport Chapter of the Environmental Statement;
- revised ‘*Ecological Baseline Update Survey*’ and ‘*Bird Management Strategy*’ (BMS) (July 2014);
- ‘*Proposed Area of Long-Term Management Plan*’ (Plan 1 rev D in the S106 Agreement); and,
- revised ‘*Restoration Masterplan*’ (Rev H, dated July 2016).
- letter (dated 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015) including revised ES Non-Technical Summary (received May 2015), revised ES Ch.2 (March 2015), revised application drawings (Figs.2A-11A) & revised ES drawings Figs.2.1A, 2.3A, 2.4A, 3.1A-3.6A & 3.9A;
- letter (dated 26<sup>th</sup> February 2016) including revised ES Ch.3 (February 2015) and ‘*Proposed Area of Long Term Management Plan*’ (Plan 1 rev D in the S106 Agreement);
- letter (20<sup>th</sup> October 2016) including information from Hafren Water Ltd (dated 17<sup>th</sup> October 2016), an *Ecological Baseline Update Survey* (October 2016), Post-application Cross Section of Phase 2 (drwg no. K034/00198) (10<sup>th</sup> August 2016) and conveyance (dated 31<sup>st</sup> May 1960);
- letter (21<sup>st</sup> November 2016) & annexes plus revised ES Ch.12 (April 2013) & Ch.7 (November 2014), revised *Archaeological Scheme of Works* (November 2014), revised *Restoration Masterplan* (drwg no. K034-210 Rev.H) (dated 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016), *Statement on Geological Investigation* (10<sup>th</sup> November 2016) and revised draft S106 Legal Agreement and accompanying documents; and,
- e-mail (24<sup>th</sup> November 2016) including revised Annex 1 & enclosing revised ‘*Phasing Plan - Phase 5*’ (4<sup>th</sup> March 2015)
- a ‘*Preliminary Bat Mitigation Strategy*’ (January 2017) prepared on behalf of the applicant by E<sup>3</sup> Ecology Ltd;
- detailed drawings submitted under cover of agent letter dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017;

as well as other details as may be subsequently approved and the following conditions, which at all times take precedence.

*REASON:*

Duration of planning permission

3. The development hereby permitted authorises the extraction of sand and gravel for a period of a twenty years from the date of the notification of the commencement of sand and gravel extraction (as required by condition no. 1 above); after which time those operations shall be discontinued and the land restored wholly in accordance with the agreed *Detailed Restoration and Management Plan* as contained within the Section 106 Legal Agreement within one year (twelve months).

*REASON:*

Limitations to the permission

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 17 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any other Act

revoking or re-enacting the order, no plant or buildings shall be erected within the application site outwith the plant site shown on application drawing 'Phasing Plan-Composite' (drwg no. NT10306/12/Fig3.1 rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015) without the prior grant of planning permission.

*REASON:*

5. No development within Phase 2 shall commence until a scheme providing detailed designs of the two river crossings (bridges) (the abutments of which shall be at least 5 metres from the channel edge), including their construction and their subsequent removal upon completion of mineral extraction, has been submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter, the two bridges shall be constructed in strict accordance with the approved scheme.

*REASON:*

6. Prior to the removal of the 'east bridge', a scheme for the feasibility of its retention for public access, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority and, subject to prior consultation with the Environment Agency and the Swale & Ure Drainage Board or any successor bodies thereto, be subject to the County Planning Authority's written approval.

*REASON:*

Noise

7. No development shall commence until a 'Noise Management Plan' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority which details how noise levels will be monitored at the monitoring locations as defined within the Environmental Statement. Such a scheme shall include measures to control noise from the use of fixed and/or mobile plant and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) at the site. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved scheme that shall be maintained at all times and reviewed on an annual basis.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT*

8. The noise levels  $L_{Aeq}(1 \text{ hour})$  operated by the quarrying operation at the site shall not exceed 55dB at the monitoring locations as defined in the Environmental Statement (as shown on *Figure 11.1 – Noise Sensitive Receptors* found within Environmental Statement and Table 11.6).

*REASON:*

9. The noise levels  $L_{Aeq}(1 \text{ hour})$  operated by the temporary quarrying operations at the site shall not exceed 70dB for a maximum period of up to eight weeks in any one year.

*REASON:*

10. Within six months of commencement of each operational phase of the extraction operations as defined on drwg no ##, an assessment of

compliance with the above noise level limits shall be undertaken and submitted, which shall include a timescale for the delivery of any necessary noise mitigation measures. The methodology for the compliance assessment shall be submitted to and agreed with the County Planning Authority in advance of the assessment.

*REASON:*

Water protection

11. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until such time as a *Water Management Plan* is submitted and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority setting out the following:
- a) details of the proposed dewatering at the site;
  - b) measures for the protection of licensed sources;
  - c) measures for the maintenance of spring fed flows; and,
  - d) details of the monitoring of surface water and groundwater before, during and for a year after final cessation of works has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the County Planning Authority. Any such scheme shall be supported by detailed information to include a maintenance programme and establish current and future ownership of the facilities such as sluice gates to also be provided;
  - e) the storage of any materials including chemicals, oils and/or other hazardous materials; and,
  - f) details of site drainage connections of the lakes to the River Swale and Fiddle Beck.

Any such scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the approved scheme, or any changes as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the County Planning authority.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT*

12. Surface water from all vehicle parking areas and hard-standing areas shall be passed through an oil interceptor(s) of adequate capacity prior to discharge to the drainage system.

*REASON:*

13. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.

*REASON:*

14. The site office shall not be located within either Flood Zone 2 or 3 and a plan showing the location of the office shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

15. A minimum 20-metre stand-off from the channel edge of the River Swale in Phase 2, shall be set out on site and thereafter, no extraction shall approach closer than that point throughout the duration of the development hereby permitted. The channel edge, the edge of extraction and the lake-side edge (which shall be at least a further 10 metres from the line of the 20-metre stand-off from the channel edge) shall be first determined by the submission of detailed extraction designs to be submitted to the County Planning Authority for its written approval prior to the extraction of any mineral in Phase 2.

*REASON:*

16. Prior to the commencement of development in Phase 2, details of lakeside bank reinforcement to be incorporated into the design of the 'west lake' to protect against wave erosion within the lake and to mitigate against erosion by the River Swale shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for its approval in writing.

*REASON:*

Soil handling

17. Prior to the commencement of the development in Phase 1 and prior to the commencement in each phase thereafter, a detailed *Soils Management Plan* shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for its approval in writing. Thereafter, soils shall be managed in strict accordance with the *Soils Management Plan* approved under this condition.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT - regular consideration of this matter on a phase-by-phase basis is considered appropriate in respect of the development.*

18. Any soil storage heaps shall either be located in Flood Zone 1 or in a location where satisfactory compensatory storage has been created. The satisfactory compensatory storage shall be completed prior to the commencement of the creation of the soil heap that the storage is designed to offset, or within any other period as may be subsequently agreed, in writing, by the County Planning Authority.

*REASON: To provide compensatory storage for soil heaps in Flood Zone 3.*

19. Any soil storage heaps located in Flood Zone 3 shall have level-for-level compensatory storage provided.

*REASON:*

20. All top-soil, sub-soil and overburden materials shall be identified separately and then stripped and stored accordingly and either placed directly to final restoration of the site or stored separately in temporary storage mounds in accordance with the submitted application details. All soils shall be handled in accordance with the guidance set out in DEFRA's '*Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils*'.

*REASON:*

21. No soils shall be stripped, moved, placed or removed during the months of November to March inclusive, unless the said soils are dry and friable. Soils shall only be stripped, moved, placed or removed during dry conditions and soils shall not be removed whilst wet. During soil stripping, placement and removal, machinery shall be routed so as to avoid compaction of such soils.

*REASON:*

Permitted hours of operation

22. No soil stripping or bund construction or overburden removal shall take place except between the following times:

*0700 – 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays.*

No soil stripping or bund construction or removal shall take place at all on Saturdays / Sundays / Public / Bank Holidays.

No mineral extraction shall take place except between the following times:

*0700 – 1900 hours Mondays to Fridays; and,*

*0700 – 1300 hours on Saturdays.*

Mineral processing, mineral export, and servicing and maintenance shall only take place between the following times:

*0700-1900 hours Mondays to Fridays; and,*

*0700-1300 on Saturdays*

No mineral processing, mineral export, and servicing and maintenance shall take place at all on Sundays / Public / Bank Holidays.

*REASON:*

Processing Plant

23. No fixed plant shall be erected within the site until full details of its siting, design, lighting, appearance and screening have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

Access

24. There shall be no access to the site from the public highway other than by the access to the site from Low Street as shown on application drawing '*Phasing Plan-Composite*' (drwg ref. no. NT10306/12/Fig3.1 rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015).

*REASON:*

25. Wheel-cleaning facilities shall be made available from the commencement of the development on the site and be kept available and in full working order until such time as the County Planning Authority agrees in writing to their withdrawal.

*REASON:*

Dust management

26. Prior to the commencement of any development a *Dust Mitigation Scheme* shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

27. Measures, including the spraying of roadways and stockpiles and the discontinuance of soil movements during periods of high winds, shall be taken to ensure that the site is operated at all times with the aim to minimise dust emissions and, in particular, during periods of high winds.

*REASON:*

Archaeology

28. Development will be undertaken in accordance with the *Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation* prepared by Archaeological Research Services Ltd (November 2014). No change shall be made to the *Written Scheme of Investigation* referred to in this condition without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

29. The applicant company shall formally notify the County Planning Authority in writing within 14 days of the completion of archaeological mitigation fieldwork.

*REASON:*

30. Within 24 months of completing the archaeological field investigations required by condition no. ##, a report which shall comprise of an assessment of the archaeological remains recovered from the site and an outline of the subsequent programme of analyses, publication (including a date for publication) and archiving, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The programme of analyses, publication and archiving shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved, and in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

Biodiversity and landscape matters

31. The development shall not be commenced until a *Landscape and Biodiversity Restoration and Management Strategy* has been submitted to



and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. It shall include, amongst other matters, details of the following:

- advance and phased landscape and biodiversity mitigation and maintenance measures. Works intended to be temporary and those intended to be long-term shall be clearly distinguished and details provided shall also include
  - the trees, vegetation and habitats to be protected during extraction and the means of their protection;
  - the species to be planted and their source, size and spacing;
  - the method of planting, establishment and protection; and,
  - the replacement of failures;
- post-extraction phased amenity, nature conservation and agricultural restoration and enhancement works; and,
- maintenance and ‘*after-care*’, and post ‘*after-care*’ management and monitoring where relevant.

The *Landscape and Biodiversity Restoration and Management Strategy* shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved programme and scheme.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT - To secure mitigation and progressive restoration of the site.*

32. During the appropriate ecological survey period immediately prior to commencement of works on site, pre-commencement surveys for otter, water vole and white-clawed crayfish shall be undertaken. The surveys shall include mitigation measures as necessary including the timing/phasing thereof. The results of these surveys and the identified mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority prior to the start of any works. The mitigation measures shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved timing/phasing or any details as may be subsequently agreed, in writing, by the County Planning Authority.

*REASON:*

33. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme detailing the monitoring of bats shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for its written approval. Thereafter, the scheme shall be implemented wholly in accordance with the details contained therein. The scheme shall provide for the undertaking of additional bat surveys upon the demolition of any buildings including that of Broad Close Farm or its associated buildings or the removal of any trees. The scheme shall also enure for the duration of the operational phase of the development hereby permitted as well as the duration of the statutory five year ‘*after-care*’ period.

*REASON:*

Highways

34. No development shall commence until full details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority:

a. vehicular parking within the site for Heavy Goods Vehicles using the site.

*REASON:*

35. No sand and gravel shall be removed from the site, as shown on application drawing '*Phasing Plan-Composite*' (drwg ref. no. NT10306/12/Fig3.1 rev A, dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015), by road, until the local access road (LAR) is constructed connecting to Low Street allowing access to the A1 upgrade as shown on Highways Agency plans dated 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2013 is completed and open to the public.

*REASON:*

36. There shall be no access or egress between the highway and the application site by any vehicles other than via the access point with the public highway at Low Street. The access shall be maintained in a safe manner which shall include the repair of any damage to the existing adopted highway occurring during construction.

*REASON:*

37. There shall be no access or egress by any vehicles between the highway and the application site until full details of any measures required to prevent surface water from non-highway areas discharging onto the existing or proposed highway together with a programme for their implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and programme.

*REASON:*

38. There shall be no movement by construction or other vehicles between the highway and the application site (except for the purposes of constructing the initial site access) until that part of the access extending 25 metres into the site from the carriageway of the existing highway has been made up and surfaced in accordance with the approved details and/or *Standard Detail number E3* and the published *Specification of the Highway Authority*. All works shall accord with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Any damage during use of the access until the completion of all the permanent works shall be repaired immediately.

*REASON:*

39. There shall be no access or egress by any vehicles between the highway and the application site (except for the purposes of constructing the initial site access) until splays are provided giving clear visibility of 160 metres by 4.5 metres measured along both channel lines of the major road Low Street

from a point measured 4.5 metres down the centre line of the access road as shown on the WA Fairhurst Drawing 103821/1002 revA dated ## ## ##. The eye height will be 1.05 metres and the object height shall be 0.6 metres. Once created, these visibility areas shall be maintained clear of any obstruction and retained for their intended purpose at all times.

*REASON:*

40. There shall be no excavation or other groundworks, except for investigative works, or the depositing of material on the site in connection with the construction of the access road or building(s) or other works until:
- the details of the required highway improvement works, listed below, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority:
    - a) an independent Stage 2 Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with HD19/03 - Road Safety Audit or any superseding regulations; and,
    - b) a programme for the completion of the proposed works has been submitted. The required highway improvements shall include:
      - i. to improve the road alignment of Low Street towards the A1 (M) and strengthen that part of Low Street from the site access to the Local Access Road (see WA Fairhurst drawing 103821/1002a dated ## ## ##).

*REASON:*

41. There shall be no excavation or other groundworks, except for investigative works, or the depositing of material on the site until the following highway works have been constructed in accordance with the details approved in writing by the County Planning Authority
- a. works to improve the road alignment of Low Street towards the A1(M) and strengthen that part of Low Street from the site access to the Local Access Road (see WA Fairhurst drawing 103821/1002a dated ## ## ##).

*REASON:*

42. There shall be no excavation or other groundworks, except for investigative works, or the depositing of material on the site in connection with the construction of the access road or building(s) or other works hereby permitted until full details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority:
- a) vehicular turning arrangements;
  - b) manoeuvring arrangements; and
  - c) loading and unloading arrangements.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT*

43. There shall be no access or egress by any vehicles between the highway and the application site until details of the precautions to be taken to prevent the deposit of mud, grit and dirt on public highways by vehicles travelling to and from the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. These facilities shall include the provision of wheel cleaning facilities where considered necessary by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. These precautions shall be made available before any excavation or depositing of material in connection with the construction commences on the site and be kept available and in full working order and used until such time as the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority agrees in writing to their withdrawal.

*REASON: PRE-COMMENCEMENT*

44. There shall be no establishment of a site compound, site clearance, demolition, excavation or depositing of material in connection with the construction on the site until proposals have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority for the provision of:

- (i) on-site parking capable of accommodating all staff and sub-contractors vehicles clear of the public highway; and
- (ii) on-site materials storage area capable of accommodating all materials required for the operation of the site.

The approved areas shall be kept available for their intended use at all times that construction works are in operation. No vehicles associated with on-site construction works shall be parked on the public highway or outside the application site.

*REASON:*

45. There shall be no establishment of a site compound, site clearance, demolition, excavation or depositing of material in connection with the construction on the site until details of the routes to be used by HCV construction traffic have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Thereafter, the approved routes shall be used by all vehicles connected with construction on the site.

*REASON:*

46. Prior to the development being brought into use, a *Travel Plan* shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. This shall include:

- (i) the appointment of a travel co-ordinator;
- (ii) a partnership approach to influence travel behaviour;
- (iii) measures to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport other than the private car by persons associated with the site;
- (iv) provision of up-to-date details of public transport services;
- (v) continual appraisal of travel patterns and measures provided through the travel plan;

- (vi) improved safety for vulnerable road users;
- (vii) a reduction in all vehicle trips and mileage;
- (viii) a programme for the implementation of such measures and any proposed physical works; and
- (ix) procedures for monitoring the uptake of such modes of transport and for providing evidence of compliance.

The *Travel Plan* shall be implemented and the development shall thereafter be carried out and operated in accordance with the *Travel Plan*.

*REASON:*

Restoration

47. Full details of the works to be implemented to restore each phase shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority within six months of the commencement of mineral extraction within that phase.

The scheme shall include details of:

- soil and overburden movements, final levels, and ground preparation and cultivation;
- fencing and access;
- plant material (including species, sources, numbers, size and planting distance; and,
- establishment, plant protection, maintenance and management of existing and new planting and habitats for the duration of the development.

Thereafter restoration works shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

*REASON: to reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority and in the interests of the environment and amenity*

48. An annual meeting shall be held between representatives of the site operator and the County Planning Authority to review schemes of working, restoration, landscaping and aftercare issues. This meeting shall include all interested parties and technical advisers as required.

*REASON:*

After-care

49. Within six months of the certification in writing by the County Planning Authority of the completion of restoration, as defined in this permission, a scheme and programme for the 'after-care' of the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing

The scheme and programme shall contain details of the following:

- (i) maintenance and management of the restored site to promote its agricultural, forestry or amenity use;
- (ii) weed control where necessary;
- (iii) measures to relieve compaction or improve drainage; and,
- (iv) an annual inspection to be undertaken in conjunction with representatives of the operator and the County Planning Authority to assess the 'after-care' works that are required in the following year.

REASON:

50. Detailed schemes of 'after-care' for those parts of the site to be restored to amenity and nature conservation uses shall be submitted within twelve months of the commencement of mineral extraction within each phase, to include details of establishment, maintenance, protection and management of vegetation and habitats. Thereafter, the approved schemes shall be implemented for a period of five years from completion of restoration of each relevant phase

*REASON: To ensure satisfactory restoration and beneficial after use of the site.*

51. Within twelve months of the completion of development in any phase, the areas to be restored to agricultural use shall be restored in accordance with a detailed scheme of agricultural restoration to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter, agricultural 'after-care' shall take place only in accordance with the approved scheme.

*REASON: To ensure satisfactory restoration and beneficial after use of the site.*

**[N.b. Any *Informatives* together with an *Approved Documents List* to be completed following determination of this application]**

**Statement of compliance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England & Wales) Regulations 1999**

*In determining this application, pursuant to Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England & Wales) Regulations 1999, the County Planning Authority has considered the Environmental Statement (2009) and subsequent Revised Chapters (March 2015), including the further and other information submitted by the applicant company, including such information as is reasonably required to assess the environmental effects of the development and which the applicant company could be reasonably required to compile, and has taken into account the environmental information relating to this application, namely the Environmental Statement and subsequent revised Chapters and Addendum Non-Technical Summary, including further and other information submitted by the applicant company and duly-made representations about the environmental effects of the development.*

**Statement of Compliance with Article 35 of the Town and Country Development Management Procedure Order 2015**

*In determining this planning application, the County Planning Authority has worked with the applicant company adopting a positive and proactive manner. The County Council offers the opportunity for pre-application discussion on applications and the applicant company, in this case, chose to take up this service. Proposals are assessed against the extant policies that comprise the Development Plan (which have been subject to proactive publicity and consultation prior to their adoption) and their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework. During the course of the determination of this application, the applicant company has been informed of the existence of all consultation responses and representations made*

*in a timely manner which provided the Applicant company/Agent with the opportunity to respond to any matters raised. The County Planning Authority has sought solutions to problems arising by liaising with consultees, considering other representations received and liaising with the applicant company as necessary. Where appropriate, changes to the proposal were sought when the statutory determination timescale allowed.*


D BOWE

Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services

Background Documents to this Report:

1. Application ref. no. NY/2010/0356/ENV (registered as valid on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010). Application documents can be found on the County Council's Online Planning Register by using the following weblink:  
<https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/register/PlanAppDisp.aspx?recno=7585>
2. Consultation responses received;
3. Representations received; and,
4. Officer Report to Committee on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> August 2016.

Author of report: Vicky Perkin



Extract from application details (drwg ref. no. NT10306/12/fig 2.1, dated March 2015)



## North Yorkshire County Council

## Business and Environmental Services

## Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee

4 April 2017

**C1/16/00507/CM - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE VARIATION OF CONDITION NO'S 1, 20, 23 & 52 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. C1/39/34G TO ALLOW THE CONTINUATION OF SAND AND GRAVEL EXTRACTION FOR A FURTHER 4 YEAR PERIOD UNTIL 31 DECEMBER 2020 WITH FINAL RESTORATION BY 31 DECEMBER 2021 AND REMOVAL OF THE PLANT SITE BY 31 DECEMBER 2022 AND AMENDMENTS TO THE PHASING AND DIRECTION OF WORKING AND A RECONFIGURED LAYOUT FOR THE CONVEYOR ON LAND AT SCORTON QUARRY, RICHMOND, NORTH YORKSHIRE ON BEHALF OF TARMAC LTD (RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT) (CATTERICK BRIDGE ELECTORAL DIVISION)**

## Report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services

**1.0 Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To determine a planning application for the variation of condition No's 1, 20, 23 & 52 of planning permission ref. C1/39/34G to allow the continuation of sand and gravel extraction for a further 4 year period until 31 December 2020 with final restoration by 31 December 2021 and removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022 and amendments to the phasing and direction of working and a reconfigured layout for the conveyor on land at Scorton Quarry, Richmond, North Yorkshire on behalf of Tarmac Ltd.
- 1.2 This application is subject to 4 objections having been raised by members of the public and is, therefore, reported to this Committee for determination. The grounds for objection from the members of the public are detailed within paragraph 5.3 of this report.

**2.0 Background**Site Description

- 2.1 The application site is Scorton Quarry, Scorton, Richmond, incorporating the former Tancred Quarry, Scorton. The area of the application site is 128 hectares. The permitted areas of sand and gravel extraction are located to both the north and south of the B6271 public highway, linking the villages of Scorton and Bolton-on-Swale with Brompton-on-Swale and Catterick. Historical workings have taken place to the north and south of the B6271 as part of Tancred Quarry, at the time operated by Tancred Gravel Ltd. At the same time, the operation of Scorton Quarry has solely been located to the north of the B6271 historically having been operated by Tilcon Ltd prior to Tarmac Ltd. The area of land to the north of the B6271 is located approximately 200 metres to the west of the village of Scorton and forms the larger parcel of land and this area has now all been extracted and restored (Phases 1-4) with the exception of the processing plant area. Extraction currently takes place south of the B6271 in phase 5. The quarry offices, plant site and weighbridge are all located in the northern part of the quarry and road traffic gains access to them from the quarry entrance off the B6271. The land to the south of the B6271 (Phases 5 & 6) lies approximately 250 metres south west of the village of Scorton and to the north west of the village of Bolton-on-Swale (250 metres away) and east of the River Swale.

- 2.2 The surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the application site are predominantly agricultural. However, the site is bordered in two areas to the west, firstly by Tancred landfill site (inert) operated by Yorwaste Ltd and secondly by the former Scorton landfill site previously operated by Yorwaste Ltd. Scorton cemetery is 175 metres east of the extraction boundary of Phase 6.
- 2.3 The nearest residential properties to the application site (Phases 5 & 6) are those located within the villages of Scorton and Bolton-on-Swale. Outside of these main residential areas, the nearest residential property to the site is 'Tancred Grange' located to the north of the B6271 and 130 metres north of the extraction limit in Phases 5 and 6. The extraction boundary of Phase 6 at its eastern extent is approximately 160 metres from the rear of residential properties on the western side of Bolton Road (West View, Heather Ridge, Arrochar, Field View, The Old Orchard, Derrydale, Lakedale, Olives View and Hengistbury).
- 2.4 The application site is affected by a number of planning constraints. Firstly, due to the size of the site, areas of the site are located in both Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. Phase 5 is within Flood Zone 2 and Phase 6 in Flood Zone 1. The site is also within the boundary of the Bedale and Upper Swale Internal Drainage Board Area (IDB). To the south of the site, adjacent to the application area (Phases 5 & 6) is the Swale Lakes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) part of Bolton on Swale Nature Reserve, whilst approximately 65 metres west and south-west of the site on the opposite bank of the river is the locally designated Catterick Gravel Pitts Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The limit of extraction in Phase 6 would be 350 metres from the Scorton village Conservation Area and 200 metres from the Bolton on Swale village Conservation Area. However, no part of the site is within a 'sensitive area' as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.
- 2.5 Across the site there are 6 public rights of way, 4 bridleways (no's 20.58/1, 20.58/3, 20.58/13 & 20.58/11) and two footpaths (no's 20.8/1 & 20.58/12). 'Wainwright's Coast to Coast' is a 294km long distance footpath connecting St Bees on the west coast with Robin Hood's Bay on the east coast. The 'Coast to Coast' Long Distance Footpath does not benefit from National Trail status but comprises Bridleway 20.58/1/1; Footpath 20.8/1/1; Bridleway 20.8/2/1; Footpath 20.8/3/2. It passes within close proximity to Phase 5 and 6 of Scorton Quarry.
- 2.6 A plan showing the application site is attached to this report at Appendix A and an aerial photo at Appendix C.

#### Planning History

- 2.7 The planning history of the application site is extensive due to the interlinking nature of both Scorton and Tancred Quarries in more recent years. Sand and gravel has been extracted from land at the site for many years under the grant of 13 planning permissions, between 1952 and 1997.
- 2.8 On 18 November 2002, planning permission C1/39/34E was granted for a consolidation of the earlier permissions into a single consent with associated revisions and extensions to the working area. Condition 51 of the permission limited mineral extraction only until 31 December 2016 with restoration by 31 December 2017. The permission is accompanied by a Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 18 November 2002 ("Original Agreement") which relates to long term aftercare management of the restored site (nature conservation and recreational use areas) for a period of 25 years after expiry of the final aftercare period (5 years) in the form of Tier 1 (for Phase 1) and Tier 2 (for Phases 2-6) Management Plans, cessation of mineral extraction in the old planning permission areas of Tancred Quarry, removal of the processing plant at Tancred Quarry and the establishment of a Local Community Liaison Group.

- 2.9 On 26 January 2004, planning permission C1/39/34G was granted to Tarmac Northern Ltd & Tancred Gravel Ltd, for the consolidation of existing permissions, revisions to working and restoration proposals and an extension of working with modification to conditions 1, 19, 20, 21 and 22 attached to planning permission C1/39/34E. The development principles established in the 2004 permission involved progressive working over six main phases, with restoration predominantly to water based recreation and nature conservation. Condition 52 of the permission limited mineral extraction only until 31 December 2016 with restoration by 31 December 2017. The permission is accompanied by a Section 106 legal agreement dated 23 January 2004 which secured the continuation, and revision as necessary, of the covenants contained within the Original Agreement attached to permission C1/39/34E dated 18 November 2002 (see above) and also covers the additional issues of diversion of the Coast to Coast public right of way, interim management of land adjoining the River Swale and details of bird management and control.
- 2.10 On 5 July 2007, planning permission C1/39/34L/CM was granted to Tarmac Ltd & Tancred Gravel Ltd, for a 7.6 hectare extension to the site, to be worked in two phases moving generally south to north. The mineral would be extracted using a hydraulic excavator and transported to the existing quarry processing plant, located approximately one kilometre to the west via a conveyor system. This permission granted the extraction of approximately 42,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from the site until the 30 April 2009. The permission was accompanied by a Section 106 legal agreement dated 3 April 2006 to safeguard the long term restoration and management of the land, the implementation of suitable bird control measures and the dedication of a new public right of way. The permission has now expired.
- 2.11 On 14 January 2016 the Authority issued a Scoping Opinion ref. NY/2015/0242/SCO in respect of those matters that the County Planning Authority required to be assessed in undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the development the subject of this application.
- 2.12 The most recent Site Monitoring visit for the site was completed in January 2017. The report for that visit highlighted that there are no significant 'follow-up actions' or outstanding matters relating to planning permission C1/39/34G nor have there been any complaints received in relation to operations at the site.
- 2.13 On 15 March 2017 planning permission C1/16/00784/CM was granted under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the variation of condition No. 3 of Planning Permission Ref. No. C1/39/34H(I)/CM which relates to the duration of development to allow for an extension of time of the aggregate bagging plant until 31 December 2022 on land at Scorton Quarry. The aggregate bagging plant is located immediately to the south of the Quarry plant processing area. This is a stand-alone permission with a red line boundary adjacent to the main Scorton Quarry permission boundary and the permission includes requirements for restoration to agricultural upon expiry of the permission.

### **3.0 The Proposal**

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for the variation of condition No's 1, 20, 23 & 52 of planning permission ref. C1/39/34G to allow the continuation of sand and gravel extraction for a further 4 year period until 31 December 2020 with final restoration by 31 December 2021 and removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022 and amendments to the phasing and direction of working and a reconfigured layout for the conveyor on land at Scorton Quarry, Richmond, North Yorkshire on behalf of Tarmac Ltd.

- 3.2 The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement that reports on the results of the EIA and assesses the significance of any potential impact of the proposed development in relation to the following:- Landscape and Visual Impact, Ecology, Soils and Agriculture, Water Resources, Cultural Heritage, Noise, Air Quality Traffic and Cumulative Effects.
- 3.3 Condition 1 (Approved documents) of planning permission C1/39/34G currently reads:  
*'The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application details dated 10 January 2001 (as amended) (Ref C1/39/34E) and as further amended by the application dated 11 April 2003 (Ref C1/39/34G) and the following schedule of conditions which at all times shall take precedence or in accordance with such other details as may be subsequently approved in writing by the County Planning Authority'.*
- 3.4 It is proposed to amend Condition 1 to allow development in accordance with the details to be approved under this application.
- 3.5 Condition 20 (Method of working) of planning permission C1/39/34G currently reads:  
*'Mineral extraction shall proceed only in accordance with the phasing arrangements and direction of working indicated on the application drawings and as set out in the application details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority'.*
- 3.6 It is proposed to amend Condition 20 to allow phases 5 and 6 to be worked in different directions to that previously approved.
- 3.7 Condition 23 (Location of conveyor) of planning permission C1/39/34G currently reads:  
*'Except as provided for in the application details and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority, no mineral shall be transported from the working face to the processing plant area except in accordance with the details set out in the planning application and accompanying information and in particular the routing of the conveyor system and the locations of the conveyer transfer points shall only be as set out in the application details'.*
- 3.8 It is proposed to amend Condition 23 to allow for a reconfigured layout for the conveyor in Phases 5 and 6.
- 3.9 Condition 52 (End date of extraction) of planning permission C1/39/34G currently reads:  
*'Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority the permission hereby granted authorises the extraction of minerals only until 31 December 2016. The development hereby permitted shall be discontinued and all plant and machinery associated with the development shall be removed from the site and the site restored in accordance with the application details and the requirements of this Decision Notice within 12 months of the cessation of mineral extraction or by 31 December 2017, whichever is the sooner'.*
- 3.10 It is proposed to amend Condition 52 to extend the current permitted end date for mineral extraction from 31 December 2016 to 31 December 2020, with final restoration by 31 December 2021 and removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022.

### Mineral Reserves

- 3.11 At the time of the submission of the planning application (June 2016) the remaining sand and gravel reserves within the quarry was calculated at approximately 1.8 million tonnes (approximately 1.2 million tonnes in phase 5 and 600,000 tonnes in phase 6). As of 1 January 2017 that has reduced to 1.3 million tonnes of permitted reserves which were not extracted before the expiry of the planning permission on 31 December 2016. The sand and gravel extracted from Scorton Quarry is used for the production of ready mixed concrete, pre-cast concrete products and other construction sector uses. The product is sold either directly from the stockpiles or from the bagging plant that operates next to the processing site. The applicant states that the permitted reserves were not fully extracted before the expiry of the permission because forecasted output from the quarry when the planning permission was originally granted exceeded actual output, primarily because of the drop in demand for quarry products during the recent recession.

### Duration

- 3.12 The application proposes a 4 year extension to the life of the site for mineral extraction operations until 31 December 2020 with final restoration being completed by 31 December 2021 with the removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022.

### Annual output

- 3.13 The 4 year extension of time assumes an output of 400,000 tonnes per annum. It is anticipated that this level of output will continue until the end of 2020.

### Mineral extraction

- 3.14 The application does not seek to amend the limit of extraction or seek to extend or deepen the working beyond that previously approved, no additional mineral is sought to be permitted for extraction. In addition the output levels, working hours, site access and general infrastructure would remain unchanged. The application seeks to amend the date when quarrying is to cease and make minor amendments to the phasing, method and direction of working and a reconfigured layout for the conveyor.
- 3.15 The remaining phases 5 & 6 have previously been worked down to a level slightly above the water table then restored to an agricultural use. The current planning permission allows extraction below this level. Part of each phase was used for silt lagoons, which overlie the sand and gravel beneath but below the restored agricultural soils. Soil will be stripped and stored in temporary stockpiles for reuse in the restoration of each phase. The overlying silt will be removed and replaced into previous working areas under water. The sand and gravel can then be extracted using excavators, firstly dry above the water table and then from below the water using long reach excavators. There is no processing of mineral within the part of the application site south of the B6271.
- 3.16 The variation to the working methods would see the use of long reach excavators rather than a dredger, and a realigned conveyor belt (Condition 23). The phases will be worked in different directions to that previously permitted. The final restorations of these phases will be amended to take account of more modern practices, leaving two lakes.
- 3.17 As workings progress through each phase, some preliminary groundworks can be undertaken to achieve the contours and ground profiling necessary for the restored site, particularly along the lake edge. Once extraction is completed, and tipping of silt into the lake from the next area of workings is completed, the phase can be fully restored through the re-placement of the subsoils and top soils and the replanting of the lake edge margins and the surrounding pasture and woodland.

### Phasing

- 3.18 The application confirms that the reserves are worked and restored in 6 phases (previously approved) as shown on the drawing attached to this report at Appendix D. Phase 4, the southern part of the quarry on the northern side of the B6271, has been restored, and part of it will remain in use as a silt lagoon until the end of extraction at the quarry at which time it will then be completely restored. Extraction currently takes place south of the road that intersects the quarry in phase 5. This field is bounded to the west and south by the River Swale. Extraction will then continue into the field to the east, phase 6 will be worked from the west to the east to allow screening of the quarry from the residential buildings located along its boundary on Bolton Road.
- 3.19 Phase 5 is shown on the phasing plan as sub divided into four areas and extraction has started in the south east corner (5A) and will be worked generally in an anti-clockwise direction. This is a minor variation from the direction shown on the current approved plan (Condition 20), due to the nature of the mineral and the location of the silt lagoons, matters which have since been clarified since the date of the original planning permission. The depth of extraction varies according to the base of the deposit, but will be approximately 10 metres below the water level.
- 3.20 The location of the conveyor is shown on the drawing attached to this report at Appendix D. It is located in the north west corner of phase 5. Prior to the start of extraction in phase 6, the conveyor will be moved to the north west corner of the new phase. This will be via an in-situ tunnel underneath the intervening minor road (Back Lane). As the conveyor point is generally an area of higher levels of activity a bund will be constructed immediately to the east of this point to assist in screening activity and associated disturbance for residents in the houses to the east of this phase.
- 3.21 This is an amendment to the conveyor arrangement from that approved under the existing permission (Condition 23) which showed a network of smaller conveyors extending into each phase. The applicant states that *“Modern mineral practice is generally to retain the conveyor loading point in one location for as long as possible, reducing the number of times that the conveyor needs to be extended. In addition, tipping into the hopper at the conveyor loading point is generally an activity that can generate noise impacts, and retaining one conveyor point in each phase as far to the west as possible away from the houses to the east of phase 6 presents an opportunity to further reduce disturbance to these neighbouring residents”*.
- 3.22 Phase 6 will then be worked in a similar manner to Phase 5, with stripping, silt relocation and long reach excavation with progressive restoration following the immediate area of extraction. It is anticipated that extraction in phase 5 will be finished in 2017, and phase 6 begun in 2018.

### Transportation and traffic

- 3.23 All mineral extracted within phases 5 and 6 will be loaded onto dump trucks up to 30 tonnes in size which will then transport the mineral to a hopper at the end of the conveyor belt, from where the mineral is then transported under the B6271 to the existing processing plant in the northern part of the quarry. At the processing plant the material is screened and graded for storage in stockpiles of different sized material. HGV's are loaded from these stockpiles for onward distribution via the weighbridge.
- 3.24 The application confirms that there would be no changes to the volume, method and direction of traffic flows. There are currently approximately 75 HGVs entering the site each day (75 in, 75 out). The HGVs gain access to the site off the B6271 from the dedicated quarry access (existing). When leaving the site, most turn to the west to join the A1(M) at Brompton on Swale or Catterick. No material from phases 5 and 6, which are south of the B6271, will exit the site other than by the existing quarry entrance on the northern side of the B6271. The existing road entrance into phase 5

on southern side of the B6271 was originally the old plant site. However, this entrance will only be used for occasional mobile plant movement and servicing.

#### Hours of operation

- 3.25 The application proposes no changes to the hours of working that are permitted under the current permission ref C1/34/39G which are set out in conditions 15- 18 within the permission as follows:-

*Condition 15: "Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority no operations or development hereby permitted shall take place within the proposed fixed processing plant area except between the following hours: 0600 – 1900 Monday to Friday, 0600 – 1400 Saturday".*

*Condition 16: "Except as required by Condition 17 below, no mineral extraction or associated removal or replacement of soil or overburden shall take place except between the following hours: 0700 – 1800 Monday to Friday, 0700 – 1300 Saturday".*

*Condition 17: "Within that part of the Phase 6 working area identified on the Plan attached hereto no operations shall take place except between the following hours: 0800 – 1700 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300, Saturday".*

*Condition 18: "Notwithstanding the provisions of Conditions 15 and 16 and except for the area referred to in Condition 17 above, essential maintenance work only shall be permitted between the additional hours of 1300 – 1700 Saturdays and 0800 – 1700 hours on Sundays".*

- 3.26 No operations would be undertaken on Bank or Public holidays.

#### Employment

- 3.27 The application details confirm that there would be no changes to existing employment arrangements and the quarry currently provides direct employment for 10 staff on site. A further 10 hauliers are contracted to deliver material from the quarry. Further staff are employed on an intermittent basis as required, such as electricians and fencing contractors.

#### Restoration and Aftercare management

- 3.28 The proposed restoration plan showing phases 5 & 6 is attached to this report at Appendix E with the anticipated timescales for completion shown at Appendix F. The site is to be restored to a mixture of conservation habitats, including grazed open parkland, lakes, marginal vegetation, wet woodland and neutral grassland. The restoration plan confirms the final shape of the lakes, the lake edge planting, the nature of habitat creation on the land surrounding the lakes and the provision of public footpaths. In addition it is proposed that existing hedgerows and woodland will be enhanced. The restoration design and implementation is guided by the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan which incorporates a bird management plan which influences the size, shape and edge profiling of the remaining lakes.
- 3.29 The restored site will be subject to the statutory 5 year aftercare period after which the applicant has committed to longer term management of the site for a further 25 years by an appropriate body for nature conservation, public access and recreation. This was detailed in documents called the Tier 1 and Tier 2 management plans secured by Section 106 legal agreement (referred to in paragraphs 2.8 & 2.9 of this report) which are now incorporated into the Long Term Management Plan which has been updated to reflect the progress of restoration at the quarry. The applicant has provided draft heads of terms for a deed of variation of the existing Section 106 legal agreement to ensure relevant matters are carried forward with any permission granted.

## 4.0 Consultations

- 4.1 The consultee responses summarised within this section of the report relate to responses to the initial consultation undertaken on 28 June 2016 and the subsequent re-consultation (on 30 September 2016) following the receipt of further/amended information comprising the covering letter from the Agent dated 7 September 2016; 'Vehicle-borne Debris Management Plan' dated September 2016; and 'Scheme for Tree Protection' dated September 2016. As required by the Regulations, notification of the Secretary of State (National Planning Casework Unit) of the planning application was undertaken on 22 June 2016.
- 4.1.1 **Richmondshire District Council (Planning)**- has not responded to the initial consultation or the reconsultation.
- 4.2 **Environmental Health Officer (Richmondshire)**- responded on 14 July 2016 with comments on noise and dust.
- 4.2.1 With regard to noise the EHO acknowledged that *“a noise impact assessment has been carried out and the noise predictions demonstrate that noise levels from the quarry are capable of complying with the current planning conditions contained within C1/39/34G. The report indicates that the continuation of the current planning conditions for noise would ensure that noise monitoring and mitigation for the site are effectively delivered. However, it is also concluded that the site is capable of operating in accordance with the new guidance contained in the PPG to the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that the current noise conditions are updated to reflect the PPG and the NPPF as follows:*
1. *During the hours of 0700 and 1900, the equivalent continuous noise level (LAeq,1h) due to site attributable noise from the quarry shall not exceed the background noise level (L90) by more than 10 dB(A) at any residential premises. In any event the total noise from operations shall not exceed 55 dB(A) LAeq.*
  2. *During the hours of 0600 and 0700, the equivalent continuous noise level (LAeq,1h) due to site attributable noise from the quarry shall not exceed 42 dB(A).*
  3. *Noise due to temporary operations for periods of up to eight weeks for the construction and removal of baffle mounds shall not exceed 70 dB(A) at any residential premises”.*
- 4.2.2 With regard to dust the EHO acknowledges that *“A new dust management plan has been submitted with the application, which includes monitoring and mitigation measures considered necessary in order to minimise dust impact particularly on those properties closest to Phase 6 on Bolton Road. This dust management plan should supersede that operated under the current planning permission”.*
- 4.2.3 The EHO has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.3 **Environment Agency**- initially responded on 8 July 2016 and stated no comments to make on the application. However in a further response dated on 23 August 2016 the EA stated that they were aware of concerns raised by NYCC (see 4.13 & 4.14) relating to management of the lakes on this site potentially leading to increased flood in the area. The EA therefore objected to the application until the issues were addressed. The EA stated that the applicant should revise their FRA/working methods to ensure that the concerns are mitigated for and that measures are put in place to both prevent siltation in Scorton Lake and to remove the build-up that has occurred.



- 4.3.1 On 12 January 2017, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information and further to the clarification provided in a letter from the applicant dated 30 November 2016, the Environment Agency confirmed that they wish to remove the objection and have no further comment to make.
- 4.4 **Highways England-** responded on 19 July 2016 and confirmed no objections to the application stating *“Although any trips generated by the development site should all be considered as ‘new’ to the network (as under the existing permission, the trips would terminate in 2016 and therefore not be on the highway network between 2016 and 2020) given the levels of predicted trips, it is not considered that the trips generated by the proposals will pose any significant concern for Highways England. Based on the assumption that 75 HGV loads will frequent the site during a working day (which is predicated information from Tarmac and does not appear to be unreasonable) and given the low numbers of employees, even when the likely peak hour HGV movements are combined with staff vehicle trips, it is likely that the impact at the A1 Catterick junction will be significantly less than 30 two way peak hour trips. Such an impact would not be considered to be material and therefore further analysis of the development’s impact at the A1 Catterick junction should not be sought”.*
- 4.4.1 Highways England has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.5 **Natural England-** responded on 25 July 2016 and noted that the application site is in close proximity to Swale Lakes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England welcomes the ongoing restoration which is being carried out which will benefit bird species which are interest features of the SSSI, and are satisfied that the proposed variation, being carried out in strict accordance with the details as submitted, will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified. Natural England therefore advise that the SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application.
- 4.5.1 Natural England has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.6 **Swale & Ure Drainage Board-** responded on 28 June 2016 and confirmed no comments on the application.
- 4.6.1 Swale & Ure Drainage Board has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.7 **Ministry of Defence Safeguarding Organisation-** responded on 5 October 2016 and confirmed no safeguarding objections to this proposal.
- 4.7.1 The MoD has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.8 **Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT)-** responded on 3 August 2016 and is happy with the level of survey contained within the application and observes that it does appear that there are complementary habitats on the different sites and by working together it will be possible for a high quality restoration of the quarry site to support the Swale Lakes SSSI and provide an exceptional area for wildlife in North Yorkshire.
- 4.8.1 The YWT agrees with the contents of the Long Term Management Plan which *“is very thorough and gives a clear idea of the type of restoration which is envisaged and how it will be put in place”.* The YWT welcome the commitment from Tarmac to secure the long term maintenance of the site for 25 years following the five year aftercare period, and that this will be delivered by a suitable Management Agency.

YWT recommend that the Planning Authority seek certainty in the appointment of a Management Agency before planning permission is approved and that this is secured through an appropriate Planning Obligation.

- 4.8.2 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.
- 4.9 **NYCC Heritage - Ecology-** responded on 19 July 2016 and confirmed that the level of ecological survey and assessment was satisfactory and that no further conditions or changes to existing conditions are required from an ecological perspective. The County Ecologist is supportive of the restoration proposals and made the below comments in relation to the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan (Appendix 3.1 of ES) and the Long Term Management Plan (Appendix 3.2 of ES).
- 4.9.1 With regard to the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan, which covers the period up to the end of the 5 year aftercare period, the County Ecologist is *“supportive of the restoration concept and the proposed management team approach which has worked well on the earlier phases of restoration, allowing opportunities for additional enhancement to be taken if/when they arise”*.
- 4.9.2 With regard to the Long Term Management Plan, which covers the management of the site for 25 years after the end of the 5 year aftercare period, the County Ecologist *“supports the approach to providing a strategic framework for the management objectives and a detailed plan for the first five years, leaving flexibility in the detail for the subsequent management periods which will be informed by ongoing monitoring, management feedback from the management agency and liaison with interested parties”*.
- 4.9.3 On 10 October 2016, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information, the County Ecologist confirmed that the tree protection plan was acceptable from an ecological point of view and that there are no comments to make on the vehicle born debris plan.
- 4.10 **NYCC Heritage – Archaeology-** responded on 18 July 2016 and comments that *“The quarry is now well worked out and the majority is now restored. This means that most archaeological requirements have already been addressed in line with condition 43 of the consent for C1/39/34G. As part of the assessment, one area at the periphery of Area 6, was considered to have some archaeological potential for the preservation of a Neolithic cursus monument. This will be preserved in situ as works are not proposed in this area (para. 10.15.1). The developer proposes to disseminate the results of the archaeological work undertaken to date as part of the development (paras 10.16.1-10.16.2). This will include the publication of reports online and the erection of two interpretation panels at key points within the landscape. I fully support this. I am presuming that the earlier planning condition will remain active until it is fully discharged.”*
- 4.10.1 On 4 October 2016, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information, the County Archaeologist confirmed no further comments to add to those provided on 18 July 2016.
- 4.11 **NYCC Heritage - Principal Landscape Architect-** responded on 18 July 2016 and acknowledges that some properties along Bolton Road to the south west of Scorton would have open direct views of the quarry during Phase 6 extraction while some properties to the north west of Bolton on Swale would have partial views of Phase 6 works. However the effects on individual residential properties within 2 km of the site are stated in Appendix 6.3 to be ‘imperceptible’. The Principal Landscape Architect confirmed that the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are satisfactory.

- 4.11.1 With regard to the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan states that the proposals do not sufficiently address the protection and management of existing trees to be retained and the Principal Landscape Architect would like further information on tree protection and management during this time.
- 4.11.2 With regard to the Long Term Management Plan, the Principal Landscape Architect notes that it has not been changed other than updating of drawing references. The general approach to management at Scorton Quarry has been successful to date and the Principal Landscape Architect is happy for it to be continued.
- 4.11.3 With regard to landscape and biodiversity enhancement the Principal Landscape Architect states that consideration could be given to a programme of propagation and reinstatement Wych Elm in the landscape as part of the planting proposals.
- 4.11.4 In September 2016 the applicant submitted a Scheme for the Protection of Trees within Phases 4, 5 & 6 which formed part of the further/amended information.
- 4.11.5 On 25 October 2016, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information, the Principal Landscape Architect stated that she was not entirely happy with the Tree Protection Plan. The Principal Landscape Architect requested more detail on tree root protection areas and that there should be no trafficking or machinery or deep cultivation or drainage works within root protection areas. The Principal Landscape Architect also requested information on frequency of monitoring.
- 4.11.6 An updated version of the Scheme for the Protection of Trees within Phases 4, 5 & 6 (operational) which includes results of a tree survey undertaken in December 2016 was submitted by the applicant in January 2017. The applicant also confirmed that they would consider the potential to implement Wych Elm on site. The document was forwarded to the Principal Landscape Architect and on 7 March 2017 the Principal Landscape Architect confirmed that the revised proposals for protection during the operational period are acceptable, and it is recommended that compliance is a condition of planning permission.
- 4.12 **NYCC Arboricultural Officer-** has not responded to the initial consultation or the reconsultation.
- 4.13 **NYCC Waste Management-** responded on 23 August 2016 and highlighted that as part of their operations, Tarmac Ltd have been extracting water from, and discharging water into Scorton Lake for many years. Over time this discharge has caused the deposition of sediment in the lake. The amount of sediment, currently present in the lake, as a result of quarrying operations under the current planning permission, has severely reduced the capacity of Scorton Lake.
- 4.13.1 The response states that *“historically, North Yorkshire County Council has pumped out Scorton Lake to mitigate the flood risk of the surrounding area. The activities of Lafarge Tarmac, increasing the sediment being deposited within the Lakes, reduces the capacity of the lake, which in turns makes it very difficult for North Yorkshire County Council to manage the level of the lake and stop the land in the local area from becoming flooded”*.
- 4.13.2 The response states that there would be an increased flood risk in this area due to the ever-reducing capacity of Scorton Lake if the proposed development is permitted without further consideration.

- 4.13.3 The response states that if the proposed development is granted permission, and Scorton Lake is continued to be used in this way, the sediment will continue to build, consequently increasing the flood risk to the local area. On this basis, it is considered reasonable for Tarmac Ltd to take on the responsibility for managing the water levels of Scorton Lake (land which is in their ownership) so as to manage to flood risk in this area.
- 4.13.4 On 7 March 2017, in response to clarification provided in a letter from the applicant dated 30 November 2016, NYCC Waste Management confirmed that in light of the responses from the NYCC SuDS Officer and the Environment Agency NYCC Waste Management have no further comment to make.
- 4.14 **NYCC SuDS & Development Control Officer-** responded on 16 August 2016 with comments on surface water management.
- 4.14.1 The SuDS & Development Control Officer notes that in the Flood Risk Assessment it is proposed that surface water will continue to infiltrate into the ground which is considered satisfactory.
- 4.14.2 The SuDS & Development Control Officer states that he is aware that operations have resulted in a large build-up of silt in Scorton Lake, significantly reducing flood water storage in this area of Flood Zone 3. The SuDS & Development Control Officer states that there is no detail of any discharge into Scorton Lake and as such it is unclear how a significant amount of silt is deposited in the lake or how this can be controlled. The SuDS & Development Control Officer stated that the development should not increase flood risk off site and confirmed a holding objection until information is provided which addresses how continued operations can be ensured to result in no loss of flood storage, and to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency who are statutory consultee for development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3.
- 4.14.3 On 12 October 2016, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information, the SuDS & Development Control Officer notes that the covering letter from the Agent dated 7 September 2016 outlines current practice for the treatment of silt arisings. The SuDS & Development Control Officer acknowledged that the applicant has confirmed that no further silt will be pumped into Scorton Lake which is considered satisfactory in itself however it also states that some silt will continue to be dried out in the existing settlement lagoon. The SuDS & Development Control Officer acknowledges that the applicant states that this lagoon has an excess runoff pipe into the adjoining Scorton Lake for when the settlement lagoon is full, which suggests that silt will still be discharged to Scorton Lake, and in particular during any out of the ordinary or extreme rainfall or operational event. This must be addressed. The SuDS & Development Control Officer notes that the Environment Agency require measures to be put in place to remove the build-up of silt that has occurred in Scorton Lake, with which the SuDS & Development Control Officer would agree, and this has not been addressed.
- 4.14.4 On 3 January 2017, in response to clarification provided in a letter from the applicant dated 30 November 2016, the SuDS & Development Control Officer acknowledges that the deposition of silt into Scorton Lake will cease and also, that the pipe into Scorton lake that can transfer silt in to the lake will be blocked. In light of this the SuDS & Development Control Officer withdrew the holding objection and recommended that any planning approval prohibits by means of condition any discharge of silt into Scorton Lake. With respect to the loss of flood storage in Flood Zone 3 caused by quarry operations that have resulted in a build-up of silt in Scorton Lake, the SuDS & Development Control Officer defers to the comments of the Environment Agency.

- 4.15 **Highway Authority-** responded on 1 July 2016 and confirmed that the existing visibility at the access complies with their design standards. The LHA requested the inclusion of conditions to restrict access to only via the existing access onto the B6271 and precautions to prevent the deposit of mud on the public highway.
- 4.15.1 On 6 March 2017 the Highway Authority confirmed the acceptability of the 'Vehicle-borne Debris Management Plan'.
- 4.16 **NYCC Public Rights of Way Team-** has not responded to the initial consultation or the reconsultation.
- 4.17 **Scorton Parish Council-** responded on 18 July 2016 and confirmed that they do not wish to comment on the application.
- 4.17.1 On 27 October 2016, in response to reconsultation on the further/amended information, Scorton Parish Council confirmed no objections.
- 4.18 **Brompton on Swale Parish Council-** responded on 12 July 2016 and confirmed that have no objections or comments to make.
- 4.18.1 Brompton on Swale Parish Council has not responded to reconsultation on the further/amended information.

#### **Notifications**

- 4.19 **County Cllr. Carl Les-** was notified by letter on 28 June 2016.

#### **5.0 Advertisement and representations**

- 5.1 This application has been advertised by means of six Site Notices posted on 6 July 2016 (responses to which expired on 27 July 2016). The Site Notices were posted in the following locations: at the site entrance to the quarry (1), at the entrance to the current area of working (1), in the village of Brompton on Swale (1), in the village of Scorton (2) and to the north-east of the quarry (1). A Press Notice appeared in the North Yorkshire Advertiser on 12 July 2016 (responses to which expired on 26 July 2016).
- 5.2 A total of 85 Neighbour Notification letters were sent on 5 July 2016 and the period in which to make representations expired on 26 July 2016. The following properties received a neighbour notification letter:

1. COATES GARAGE BROMPTON ROAD, SCORTON
2. FIELD VIEW, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
3. OLIVES VIEW 2, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
4. HENGISTBURY, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
5. HEATHER RIDGE, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
6. ARROCHAR, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
7. LAKEDALE, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
8. DERRYDALE, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
9. WEST VIEW, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
10. THE OLD ORCHARD, BOLTON ROAD, SCORTON
11. TANCRED GRANGE, BROMPTON ROAD, SCORTON
12. 16, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
13. 9A 9, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
14. 14, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
15. 19, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
16. LYNDAL, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
17. 9, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
18. 11, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON

19. THE SYCAMORES, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
20. 5, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
21. SPRINGFIELD HOUSE, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
22. 1, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
23. 4, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
24. 12, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
25. 10, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
26. GREENHOLM, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
27. 6, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
28. 17, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
29. COURT HOUSE COTTAGE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
30. THE COTTAGE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
31. 7, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
32. 23, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
33. 2, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
34. ST. CLARES VIEW, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
35. 9, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
36. 5, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
37. 6, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
38. 1, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
39. 18, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
40. 2, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
41. 4, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
42. 8, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
43. 4, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
44. 3, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
45. 8, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
46. 20, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
47. HOME FARM, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
48. THE OLD COURT HOUSE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
49. WINDY RIDGE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
50. 15, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
51. HOLMLANDS, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
52. 7, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
53. 2, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
54. MOUNT SLOWLY, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
55. 10, THE ARCHERS GREEN, SCORTON
56. END HOUSE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
57. LIME TREE HOUSE, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
58. 21, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
59. BROADMEAD HOUSE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
60. 22, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
61. 5, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
62. WESTFIELD HOUSE, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
63. 7, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
64. 3, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
65. 12, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
66. THE HEIFER HIGH ROW, SCORTON
67. 6, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
68. THE STABLES, BANKS LANE, SCORTON
69. COATES COTTAGE, HIGH ROW, SCORTON
70. 3, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
71. 11, WESTFIELDS, SCORTON
72. MAPLE HOUSE, STATION ROAD, SCORTON
73. ELMFIELD HALL, STATION ROAD, SCORTON
74. WOODLANDS, STATION ROAD, SCORTON
75. ROSE VILLA, STATION ROAD, SCORTON
76. FIVE TREES, STATION ROAD, SCORTON

77. HOLMLANDS, STATION ROAD, SCORTON
78. GRANGE FARM, SCORTON
79. DEEPDALE, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
80. ROSEY HILL COTTAGE, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
81. ROSEY HILL FARM, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
82. HOLLOW BANKS, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
83. DERE COTTAGE, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
84. DERE HOUSE, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE
85. MOUSE COTTAGE, SCORTON ROAD, BROMPTON ON SWALE

5.3 A total of 4 representations raising objections to the proposed development were received following the initial consultation period/neighbour notification in July 2016. The locations of the objectors (all on the west side of Bolton Road, Scorton adjacent to Phase 6) are shown on the plan attached to this report at Appendix B. The reasons for the objections are summarised and quoted below in no particular order: -

- Adverse visual impact, noise and loss of privacy created by extraction, restoration and recreational (water based activities and fishing) after use in phase 6. Phase 6 after use should be land based activities only.
- Concern about intention to commercialise Phase 6 of restored site (recreational/water sports) and the expressed ideal of restoring Phase 6 to a nature conservation and quiet amenity area will not be met.
- The proposed non-motorised recreational activities indicate it would be developed into a *“mini Ellerton Lake commercial facility with associated services such as car parks, toilets, changing rooms, shower blocks, sail boat compounds, facilities for training etc”*. (n.b. not a material planning consideration)
- Waters sports and fishing should be confined to other phases of the development as the restoration of Phase 6 will destroy existing quiet and peaceful amenity.
- Effect of dust/grit on property and health and request for dust monitor to be relocated to a point more central to the properties on the west side of Bolton Road- in line with fence dividing ‘Derrydale’ and ‘the Old Orchard’ properties.
- The hours of work in the week from 7am until 5pm and 8am until 1pm on a Saturday do not allow for residents to have extra rest in bed either on a day off work, holiday from work or when sick or ill. This again will impact considerably on the standard of life, health and wellbeing of the residents on Bolton Road.
- Hedge at rear of properties on west side of Bolton Road needs cutting as the view is restricted and hedge should be maintained at the agreed height.
- The operator needs to install rabbit proof fencing at rear of properties on west side of Bolton Road.
- Since planning application C1/39/34G was agreed in 2010 three new properties have been built and one majorly redeveloped on Bolton Road and have been for sale since early autumn 2015- effect of extraction on property prices and sales on Bolton Road (n.b. not a material planning consideration).
- Requests for compensation for damage to property arising from extraction and dust/grit (n.b. not a material planning consideration).

5.4 In accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and County Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (EIA Regs 2011) following the receipt of further/amended environmental information relating to the Environmental Statement comprising the covering letter from the Agent dated 7 September 2016; 'Vehicle-borne Debris Management Plan' dated September 2016; and 'Scheme for Tree Protection' dated September 2016 the County Planning Authority re-publicised the application by way of six Site Notices posted 4 October 2016 (responses to which expired on 25 October 2016 ) and a Press Notice which appeared in the North Yorkshire Advertiser on 11 October 2016 (responses to which expired on 1

November 2016). In addition on 30 September 2016 those neighbours previously notified and those members of the public who had made representations on the planning application were notified of the receipt of further/amended information. No further representations were received.

## 6.0 Planning policy and guidance

### National Planning Policy

6.1 The policy relevant to the determination of this particular planning application provided at the national level is contained within the following documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (published March 2012)

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

6.3 The overriding theme of Government policy in the NPPF is to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay (if plans are up-to-date and consistent with the NPPF). The Government has set down its intention with respect to sustainable development stating its approach as *"making the necessary decisions now to realise our vision of stimulating economic growth and tackling the deficit, maximising wellbeing and protecting our environment, without negatively impacting on the ability of future generations to do the same"*. The Government defines sustainable development as that which fulfils the following three roles:

- **An economic role** – development should contribute to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation;
- **A social role** – development supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities; and,
- **An environmental role** – development that contributes to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

6.4 The NPPF advises that when making decisions, development proposals should be approved that accord with the Development Plan and when the Development Plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.

6.5 This national policy seeks to ensure that there are positive improvements in people's quality of life including improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure.



- 6.6 Paragraph 32 within Section 4 (Promoting sustainable transport) of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should take account of whether opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limits the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 6.7 Paragraph 58 within Section 7 (Requiring good design) of the NPPF identifies 6 objectives that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that new developments:
- *“function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
  - *establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;*
  - *optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;*
  - *respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;*
  - *create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and*
  - *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.”*
- 6.8 Within Section 11 of the NPPF it is clear that the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account.
- 6.9 Paragraph 109 within Section 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, minimising impacts on biodiversity, preventing development from contributing to or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.
- 6.10 Paragraph 118 within Section 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF sets out a number of principles for determining planning applications which aims to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Paragraph 118 states: *“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles (inter alia): if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused”.*
- 6.11 Paragraph 120 within Section 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF states that to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution, decisions should ensure that the development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area should be taken into account.

- 6.12 Paragraph 123 within Section 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF states that *“Planning policies and decisions should aim to:*
- *avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;*
  - *mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions;*
  - *recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and*
  - *identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason”.*
- 6.13 Paragraph 128 within Section 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the NPPF states that *“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”.*
- 6.14 Chapter 13 of the NPPF is titled ‘Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals’. Within Chapter 13 it states at paragraph 142 that minerals are *‘essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation’.* Furthermore, when determining the application consideration needs to be given to the bullet points in Paragraph 144 of the NPPF relevant to the proposed development, which states that *“When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should (inter alia):*
- *Give great weight to the benefits of the mineral extraction, including to the economy;*
  - *as far as is practical, provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas;*
  - *ensure, in granting planning permission for mineral development, that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;*
  - *ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibrations are controlled, mitigated or removed at source, and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties; and*
  - *provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary. Bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances”.*

- 6.15 Within Chapter 13 at paragraph 145 it states that “Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by (inter alia):
- *using landbanks of aggregate minerals reserves principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply, and to indicate the additional provision that needs to be made for new aggregate extraction and alternative supplies in mineral plans;*
  - *making provision for the maintenance of landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials is not compromised. Longer periods may be appropriate to take account of the need to supply a range of types of aggregates, locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and productive capacity of permitted sites;*
  - *ensuring that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition; and*
  - *Calculating and maintaining separate landbanks for any aggregate material of a specific type or quality which have a distinct and separate market”*
- 6.16 Paragraphs 203- 206 of the NPPF relate to ‘Planning conditions and obligations’. Paragraph 203 states that “*Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition*”. With regard to planning obligations paragraph 204 states that “*Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:*
- *necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
  - *directly related to the development; and*
  - *fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development”.*

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (2014)

- 6.17 On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning practice guidance documents cancelled. The NPPG supports the national policy contained within the NPPF. The guidance relevant to the determination of this application is contained within the following sections: -
- **Air Quality**  
This section provides guiding principles on how planning can take account of the impact of development on air quality. It states “*Mitigation options where necessary will be locationally specific, will depend on the proposed development and should be proportionate to the likely impact. It is important therefore that local planning authorities work with applicants to consider appropriate mitigation so as to ensure the new development is appropriate for its location and unacceptable risks are prevented. Planning conditions and obligations can be used to secure mitigation*”.
  - **Minerals**  
This provides planning guidance for mineral extraction and the application process and focuses on the environmental impacts such as noise, dust and quarry slope stability and the importance of high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites. With regard to landbanks it states “*There is no maximum landbank level and each application for minerals extraction must be considered on its own merits regardless of the length of the landbank. However, where a landbank is below the minimum level this may be seen as a strong indicator of urgent need.*”

With regard to minimising dust emissions from minerals sites the guidance states *“Where dust emissions are likely to arise, mineral operators are expected to prepare a dust assessment study, which should be undertaken by a competent person/organisation with acknowledged experience of undertaking this type of work”*. It identifies 5 key stages to a dust assessment study:

- establish baseline conditions of the existing dust climate around the site of the proposed operations;
- identify site activities that could lead to dust emission without mitigation;
- identify site parameters which may increase potential impacts from dust;
- recommend mitigation measures, including modification of site design
- make proposals to monitor and report dust emissions to ensure compliance with appropriate environmental standards and to enable an effective response to complaints.

The guidance also sets out appropriate noise standards as follows:

*“Mineral planning authorities should aim to establish a noise limit, through a planning condition, at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background noise level (LA90, 1h) by more than 10dB(A) during normal working hours (0700-1900). Where it will be difficult not to exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A) without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator, the limit set should be as near that level as practicable. In any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field). For operations during the evening (1900-2200) the noise limits should not exceed the background noise level (LA90, 1h) by more than 10dB(A) and should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field). For any operations during the period 22.00 – 07.00 noise limits should be set to reduce to a minimum any adverse impacts, without imposing unreasonable burdens on the mineral operator. In any event the noise limit should not exceed 42dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field) at a noise sensitive property”*.

The noise guidance states that increased temporary daytime noise limits of up to 70dB(A) LAeq 1h (free field) for periods of up to 8 weeks in a year at specified noise-sensitive properties should be considered to facilitate essential site preparation and restoration work (soil-stripping, the construction and removal of baffle mounds, soil storage mounds and spoil heaps, construction of new permanent landforms and aspects of site road construction and maintenance) where it is clear that this will bring longer-term environmental benefits to the site or its environs.

With regard to restoration and aftercare the guidance states:

*“The level of detail required on restoration and aftercare will depend on the circumstances of each specific site including the expected duration of operations on the site. It must be sufficient to clearly demonstrate that the overall objectives of the scheme are practically achievable, and it would normally include:*

- *an overall restoration strategy, identifying the proposed after use of the site;*
- *information about soil resources and hydrology, and how the topsoil/subsoil/overburden/soil making materials are to be handled whilst extraction is taking place;*
- *where the land is agricultural land, an assessment of the agricultural land classification grade; and*
- *landscape strategy. Where working is proposed on the best and most versatile agricultural land the outline strategy should show, where practicable, how the methods used in the restoration and aftercare enable*

*the land to retain its longer term capability, though the proposed after-use need not always be for agriculture”.*

- **Natural Environment**  
This section explains key issues in implementing policy to protect biodiversity, including local requirements. It reiterates that *“the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that pursuing sustainable development includes moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, and that a core principle for planning is that it should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution”.*
- **Noise**  
This section advises on how planning can manage potential noise impacts in new development. In terms of decision taking on planning applications it states that Authorities should take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved. It also states that *“neither the Noise Policy Statement for England nor the National Planning Policy Framework (which reflects the Noise Policy Statement) expects noise to be considered in isolation, separately from the economic, social and other environmental dimensions of proposed development”.*
- **Planning obligations**  
The guidance states that *“Planning obligations mitigate the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Obligations should meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind”.*
- **Water supply, wastewater and water quality**  
This advises on how planning can ensure water quality and provides guidance on how development can indirectly affect water bodies. The impacts upon water quality will depend on the location and character of the proposed development. The guidance acknowledges that there are likely to be options for mitigating the impact and mitigation should be practicable and proportionate to the likely impact.

#### The Development Plan

- 6.18 Notwithstanding that the abovementioned national planning policy is a significant material consideration, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning authorities must determine each planning application in accordance with the planning policies that comprise the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, therefore, the Development Plan consists of policies contained within a number of planning documents. These documents include:
- any extant planning policies contained within Plan(s) adopted by the County and District (or Borough) Councils ‘saved’ under direction of the Secretary of State; and,
  - any planning policies contained within Development Plan Documents adopted under the Local Development Framework regime.
- 6.19 The Development Plan for the determination of this particular application comprises the following:
- The ‘saved’ policies of the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (1997); and
  - The extant policies of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

- 6.20 Emerging local policies may also be afforded weight in the determination process, depending on their progress through consultation and adoption. In this respect, it is worth noting that the following document contains emerging local policies that may be of relevance to this application:
- Minerals and Waste Joint Local Plan (North Yorkshire County Planning Authority, the City of York Council and North York Moors National Park Authority).
- 6.21 The draft MWJLP was published in November 2016 for representations. At the current stage, it would not be appropriate to give any significant weight to this emerging document in respect of the development proposed in this planning application. Draft policy M07 (Meeting concreting sand and gravel requirements) states that requirements for concreting sand and gravel will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites and areas identified in the Joint Plan for working. Phases 5 and 6 at Scorton Quarry are not identified as Preferred Areas or within the Areas of Search. It is noted that in the supporting text for draft policy M07 Scorton Quarry is listed as one of the sites (Northwards Distribution) with permitted reserves of concreting sand and gravel as at 30 June 2016. Therefore Scorton Quarry's contribution to supply and maintaining the landbank is recognised.
- 6.22 The NPPF states that for the purposes of decision-taking, the policies in the Local Plan should not be considered out of date because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. However, the policies contained within the NPPF are material considerations which local planning authorities should take into account from the day of its publication.
- 6.23 If, following the 12 month transitional period given to local planning authorities to ensure compliance of their Local Plans with the NPPF, a new or amended plan has not been adopted, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (paragraph 215 of the NPPF). The closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF the greater the weight that may be given.
- 6.24 Therefore, relevant policies within the NPPF have been set out above and the relevant 'saved' policies within the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (1997) are outlined below and the level of compliance with the NPPF is considered. This exercise is not applicable to the policies contained within the more recently adopted Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) as the Local Plan Strategy is a post-NPPF adoption and has been deemed to be in compliance with the general aims of the NPPF.

#### North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan 'saved' policies

- 6.25 The Planning and Compensation Act 1991 placed a duty on each County Council in England and Wales to prepare a Minerals Local Plan. The North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan was adopted in 1997 under the 1991 Act. In the absence of an adopted MWJLP and in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as of 27 September 2007 only the 'saved' policies continue to form part of the statutory 'development plan' and provide an important part of the current local policy framework for development control decisions for minerals related development.
- 6.26 The 'saved' policies relevant to the determination of this application are set out below:
- Policy 4/1 - Determination of Planning Applications
  - Policy 4/6a - Nature Conservation and Habitat Protection – Local
  - Policy 4/10- Water Protection
  - Policy 4/13 - Traffic Impact
  - Policy 4/14 - Local Environment and Amenity

- Policy 4/15 – Public Rights of Way
  - Policy 4/20 – Aftercare
  - Policy 5/1 – Sand & Gravel Landbanks
- 6.27 ‘Saved’ Policy 4/1 – Determination of Planning Applications, states that:  
*“In considering an application for mining operations, the Minerals Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that, where appropriate:-*
- (a) the mineral deposit on the application site has been fully investigated;*
  - (b) the siting and scale of the proposal is acceptable;*
  - (c) the proposed method and programme of working would minimise the impact of the proposal;*
  - (d) landscaping and screening has been designed to effectively mitigate the impact of the proposal;*
  - (e) other environmental and amenity safeguards would effectively mitigate the impact of the proposals;*
  - (f) the proposals and programme for restoration are acceptable and would allow a high standard to be achieved;*
  - (g) a high standard of aftercare and management of the land could be achieved;*
  - (h) the proposed transport links to move the mineral to market are acceptable; and*
  - (i) any cumulative impact on the local area resulting from the proposal is acceptable”.*
- 6.28 The NPPF does not mention the matters raised in points a), b), c), d).
- 6.29 Where criterion e) is concerned, Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that any unavoidable emissions or vibrations are controlled or mitigated (if it is not possible to remove them at source).
- 6.30 With regard to criteria f) and g), Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions, where necessary.
- 6.31 Criterion h) of ‘saved’ Policy 4/1 does not conflict with the provisions of the NPPF; however, there are differences in the objectives. Criterion h) states that transport links should be acceptable whereas paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that improvements to the transport network should be considered, therefore, the NPPF should be given more weight in this instance.
- 6.32 Criterion i) of ‘saved’ Policy 4/1 is in compliance with paragraph 144 of the NPPF. Paragraph 144 states that in granting permission for mineral development the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality should be taken into account.
- 6.33 ‘Saved’ Policy 4/6A ‘Nature Conservation and Habitat Protection – Local’, states that in making decisions on planning applications, the Mineral Planning Authority will protect the nature conservation or geological interest of Local Nature Reserves and of other sites having a nature conservation interest or importance, and will have regard to other wildlife habitats.
- 6.34 This Policy is consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. Paragraph 109 states that that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity.

- 6.35 'Saved' Policy 4/10- Water Protection, states that proposals for mining operations and the associated depositing of mineral waste will only be permitted where they would not have an unacceptable impact on surface or groundwater resources. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that when preparing local plans, local planning authorities should set out environmental criteria, in line with policies in the NPPF, against which planning applications will be assessed so as to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the flow and quantity of surface and groundwater and this policy is compliant with paragraph 143 of the NPPF.
- 6.36 'Saved' Policy 4/13 – 'Traffic Impact', states that where rail, waterway or other environmentally preferable modes of transport are not feasible, mining operations other than for coal, oil and gas will only be permitted where the level of vehicle movements likely to be generated can be satisfactorily accommodated by the local highway network.
- 6.37 This Policy is consistent with the provisions of paragraph 32 of the NPPF which also states that improvements to the transport network should be considered.
- 6.38 'Saved' Policy 4/14 – Local Environment and Amenity, states that proposals for mining operations and the associated depositing of mineral waste will be permitted only where there would not be an unacceptable impact upon the local environment or residential amenity.
- 6.39 This Policy is considered to be consistent with paragraph 144 of the NPPF. Paragraph 144 states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural environment and human health and should take into account cumulative impacts of a development in a locality.
- 6.40 'Saved' Policy 4/15 entitled 'Public Rights of Way' states that where proposals would interrupt, obstruct or conflict with use of a public right of way development will only be permitted where satisfactory provision has been made in the application for protecting the existing right of way or for providing alternative arrangements both during and after working.
- 6.41 The NPPF states that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. It is considered that 'saved' Policy 4/15 is therefore consistent with the NPPF and should be afforded full weight in the determination of this application.
- 6.42 'Saved' Policy 4/20 – After-care, states that planning permissions which are subject to conditions requiring restoration to agriculture, forestry or amenity (including nature conservation) will additionally be subject to an aftercare requirement seeking to bring the restored land up to an approved standard for the specified after-use. Normally this requirement will run for a period of five years following restoration. Additionally, where forestry and amenity (including nature conservation) after-uses are proposed, the Mineral Planning Authority may seek to secure longer term management agreements.
- 6.43 This Policy is considered to be consistent with paragraph 144 of the NPPF. Paragraph 144 states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity to be carried out to high environmental standards.
- 6.44 'Saved' Policy 5/1 'Sand and Gravel Landbanks' states that *"The County Council will identify three landbanks for calculating sand and gravel provision, as follows:-*
- a) *Sand and gravel (Northwards);*
  - b) *Sand and gravel (Southwards); and*



c) *Building sand.*

*In determining which of the landbanks for sand and gravel a site falls within, the County Council will take into account the geographical location of the site and the likely external markets for the material.”*

- 6.45 This Policy is considered to be consistent with Section 13 (paragraph 145) of the NPPF which sets out that the landbank for sand and gravel reserves should be maintained at a minimum of 7 years supply.

Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014)

- 6.46 The policies considered relevant to the determination of this application are:

- Core Policy CP1 – ‘Planning Positively’;
- Core Policy CP3 – ‘Achieving Sustainable Development’;
- Core Policy CP4 – ‘Supporting Sites for Development’;
- Core Policy CP7 – ‘Promoting a Sustainable Economy’;
- Core Policy CP12 – ‘Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets’; and
- Core Policy CP13 – ‘Promoting High Quality Design’.

- 6.47 Core Policy CP1 advises that *‘When considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the plan area. Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:*

- i. *any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, taken as a whole; or*
- ii. *specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted’.*

- 6.48 Core Policy CP3 states that *“Support will be given for sustainable development which promotes (those relevant):*

- a. *the efficient use of land and infrastructure including developments with a sustainable and complementary mix of uses;*
- b. *the conservation of scarce resources and reduction of their use, and encouragement of the use and re-use of sustainable resources;*
- c. *the health, economic and social well-being, amenity and safety of the population;*
- e. *the quality of natural resources including water, air, land and biodiversity and minimises the impacts of airborne pollution;*
- f. *the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land;*
- g. *the natural drainage of surface water mitigating the effects of flash flooding of rivers, drains and drought;*
- h. *the vitality of the area;*
- i. *a high quality and adaptability of development;*
- j. *the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside;*
- k. *the distinctiveness, character, townscape and setting of settlements; and*
- l. *the historic, environmental and cultural features of acknowledged importance”.*

- 6.49 Core Policy CP4, advises that “Development or activities of a scale and nature appropriate to secure the sustainability of each settlement in the hierarchy defined in Spatial Principle SP2 and elsewhere through Spatial Principle SP3 will be supported taking account of the following:
3. Development should be consistent with the requirements of Core Policies, and should not:
    - a. impact adversely on the character of the settlement or its setting, important open spaces and views; designated and undesignated heritage assets and the character of the landscape;
    - b. lead to the loss of, or adverse impact on, or cause deterioration of important nature conservation, water bodies or biodiversity or geodiversity sites;
    - c. result in the unacceptable loss of locally important open spaces or community facilities;
    - d. be located in areas of flood risk or contribute to flood risk elsewhere;
    - e. cause significant adverse impact on amenity or highway safety”.
- 6.50 Core Policy CP7, in part advises that “support will be given to (those relevant):
- a. the development of employment activities that diversify the current offer in Richmondshire, and in particular those activities that will provide high quality jobs which can capitalise on and/or enhance the skills of the resident population; and
  - b. development which promotes the sustainable growth of the key economic sectors within the area, particularly agriculture, food, military, retail, tourism, leisure and equine enterprises”.
- 6.51 Core Policy CP12, in part advises that “Development or other initiatives will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance of the plan area’s natural and man-made, designation or undesignated assets. Development will not be supported which:
- a. has a detrimental impact upon the significance of a natural or man-made asset;
  - b. is inconsistent with the principles of an asset’s proper management.

#### *Environmental Assets*

*Where avoidance of adverse impacts is not possible, necessary mitigation must be provided to address any potential harmful implications of development. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures will be required. This approach will apply to specific assets as follows (those relevant):*

- b. *the landscape character of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to ensure a sustainable future for the natural and historic environment;*
- c. *the biodiversity and geodiversity of the plan area will be maintained, enhanced and, where appropriate, restored to ensure a sustainable future for the natural environment*
- d. *the green infrastructure network of the plan area will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced to provide a high quality, accessible, diverse and well-connected network of green space to meet the needs of the community, businesses and visitors. The key green infrastructure network includes (those relevant):*
  - vii *woodlands, scrubland, grassland, wetland, running water, wasteland, open land and parks and gardens, river banks, cycle ways and the Public Rights of Way network.*

### *Historic Assets*

1. *Those elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage assets across the Plan area will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Particular attention will be paid to those assets referred to in Paragraph 4.12.16 which make a particularly important contribution to the character and sense of place of Richmondshire.*
  2. *Where a proposal is likely to result in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and there are compelling reasons for allowing that development, opportunities will be sought to offset this harm by ensuring that other elements which contribute to the significance of that particular asset are enhanced or their significance better revealed.*
  3. *Consideration of development proposals will also need to take into account the objective of securing the long term existence of the heritage asset. This is particularly the case for those assets which have been identified as being at risk. Enabling development may be considered acceptable in the particular location (site or buildings), where all other alternatives have been explored, and the development or use proposed is the only practical means of securing the future conservation of a heritage asset”.*
- 6.52 Core Policy CP13 advises that *“High quality design of both buildings and landscaping is a priority in all development proposals. Support will be given for proposals that:*
- a. *provide a visually attractive, functional, accessible and low maintenance development;*
  - b. *respect and enhance the local context and its special qualities, including its design features, landscape, social activities, historic environment and nationally and locally recognised designations;*
  - c. *optimise the potential of the site;*
  - d. *minimise the use of scarce resources;*
  - e. *adopt sustainable construction principles;*
  - f. *facilitate access through sustainable forms of transport;*
  - g. *secure improvements to public spaces and incorporate public art, where appropriate.”*

## **7.0 Planning considerations**

- 7.1 Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides for applications for planning permission to develop land without complying with conditions previously imposed on a planning permission. The local planning authority can grant such permission unconditionally or subject to different conditions, or they can refuse the application if they decide the original condition(s) should continue.
- 7.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 also requires that all planning authorities must determine each planning application in accordance with the planning policies that comprise the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The main considerations in this instance are the appropriateness of the proposal in relation to the abovementioned planning policy framework and in particular the principle of the development considering need and the landbank and also the effect of the variation of the conditions upon local amenity (noise and air quality), highways and public access, landscape and visual impact, cultural heritage and archaeology, ecology, flood risk and the water environment and soils, restoration and aftercare.

### Principle of development

- 7.3 The acceptability of the extraction of sand and gravel from the land at Scorton Quarry (incorporating the former Tancred Quarry) has been established by a number of historical planning permissions and most recently by the grant of planning permissions in 2004 and 2007. Therefore the principle of the development has been previously established and it is a highly material planning consideration that there is permission for mineral extraction and processing operations at the application site, which has been implemented. Therefore, Members are advised that it would be inappropriate to revisit the principle of the entire development or the acceptability of the locational aspects of the quarry.
- 7.4 Members are advised to focus their attention on national, development plan policies and guidance or other material considerations that may have changed significantly since the previous grant of permission, as well as the changes sought. National Planning Policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012), replacing all of the Planning Policy Statements (PPS), Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG), Minerals Policy Statements (MPS) and Minerals Planning Guidance (MPG) notes. This includes the cancellation of MPS1 (Planning and Minerals 2006); MPS2 (Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental Effects of Mineral Extraction in England – Annexe 1 Dust and Annexe 2 Noise 2005); and MPG7 (Reclamation of Mineral Workings 1996). However, whilst these documents have been replaced, there is general consistency of approach via the advice on noise, dust and restoration set out in online National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on Minerals (March 2014) which accompanies the NPPF and replaces the original NPPF Technical Guidance. There has thus been no material change to technical national policy advice relating to mineral extraction beyond it being redrafted and re-presented in a different format.
- 7.5 There are objections which refer to a material change in circumstances since permission was granted and state that the residential layout of Scorton village has changed with the addition of three new houses on the western side of Bolton Road adjacent to Phase 6 (referred to in paragraph 2.3 of this report). The houses stand approximately 160m from the extraction boundary when working moves into phase 6. In approving such developments the District Council should have had regard to the presence of the nearby established quarry which benefitted from an extant planning permission allowing mineral extraction and restoration. The potential impacts on the amenity of these residential properties will be considered later within this section of the report.
- 7.6 This planning application made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 seeks consent for mineral extraction to continue for a further 4 years than previously consented (until 31 December 2020) to allow the extraction of the remaining reserves (estimated at approximately 1.3 million tonnes as of 1 January 2017). The applicant has confirmed that the permitted reserves were not fully extracted before the expiry of the permission (on 31 December 2016) because forecasted output from the quarry when the planning permission was originally granted exceeded actual output, primarily because of the drop in demand for quarry products during the recent recession. This proposal would enable the quarry operator to progress sand and gravel extraction for the production of ready mixed concrete, pre-cast concrete products and other construction sector uses as market conditions improve whilst also ensuring the completion of the final restoration scheme for the whole site. There are no proposals to increase the overall footprint of the site or extract additional reserves beyond that which has been previously consented.

- 7.7 The NPPF (paragraph 142), recognises that “*minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, building, energy and goods that the country needs.....*” and in paragraph 145 encourages MPA’s to plan to maintain a 7 year landbank for sand and gravel.
- 7.8 The draft Draft policy M07 (Meeting concreting sand and gravel requirements) of the MWJLP states that requirements for concreting sand and gravel will be met through existing permissions and the grant of permission on sites and areas identified in the Joint Plan for working. Phases 5 and 6 at Scorton Quarry are not identified as Preferred Areas or within the Areas of Search. In the supporting text for draft policy M07 Scorton Quarry is listed as one of the sites (Northwards Distribution) with permitted reserves of concreting sand and gravel as at 30 June 2016. Therefore Scorton Quarry’s contribution to supply and maintaining the landbank is noted. The reserves at the quarry in phases 5 and 6 are already permitted and in the landbank so account will have been taken of their significance to the steady and adequate supply of minerals in the County required by the draft plan.
- 7.9 The proposed development would avoid the sterilisation of mineral reserves and make use of existing infrastructure in place at the quarry before it is removed and the land fully restored. The proposed extension of time would avoid causing a negative impact on local employment and a negative impact on the supply of sand and gravel from a site with a long history as a quarry. The proposed continuation of mineral extraction within the permitted limits of an established quarry would reduce the requirement for new quarry sites to be developed in more “sensitive areas” to meet requirements for sand and gravel. The alternative is that the quarry is closed and infrastructure removed before the permitted deposit has been fully worked which would sterilise a valuable mineral resource (1.3m tonnes of unworked reserves as of 1 January 2017) and may not result in a high quality final restoration scheme.
- 7.10 Landbanks are an important aspect of Government policy to ensure continuity of supply of minerals and support economic growth and provision of infrastructure. The contribution the continuation of quarrying at Scorton would make towards a sufficient supply of sand and gravel and also employment in the Region is consistent with national planning policy contained within the NPPF (paragraphs 142, 144 & 145) which advise MPAs to “*give great weight to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy*” as well as Policy CP7 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) in terms of employment and the promotion of sustainable growth of key economic sectors. However, any potential adverse impacts on the environment and amenity arising from the continuation of mineral extraction need to be considered in detail and the main considerations are addressed in the subsequent sections of this report.

#### Local amenity (noise)

- 7.11 The Environmental Statement (ES) contains an assessment of the potential noise impact (Chapter 11) at noise sensitive locations as a result of the continued operation of Scorton Quarry. It is noted that objections have made reference to concerns about noise disturbance arising from the continuation of operations in phases 5 & 6.
- 7.12 The noise survey was undertaken at five individual residential properties and on nearby public footpaths in the vicinity of the quarry. It is acknowledged that noise impacts will become more sensitive as the quarry progresses into phase 6 nearer to the residential properties on the western side of Bolton Road. However the ES demonstrates that the quarry will be able to continue to operate within the controls of the noise limits set by the existing planning conditions and relevant government guidance.

- 7.13 The operational layout, location of the processing plant (within northern part of quarry), route of internal haul roads and location of screening bunds and fences have been designed to offer maximum protection from potential impacts, and to protect the amenity at nearby residential receptors. There will be no processing permitted in the quarry south of the B6271 in phases 5 & 6 (see Condition 12). Further mitigation measures to reduce noise impact include placing the conveyor hopper point as far to the west as possible in phase 6 away from the houses on Bolton Road and reducing the hours of operation for extraction in this phase (as currently arranged under the existing planning permission- see Condition 17). In addition the proposals do not include any increases in the extraction rates or changes to working practices beyond the use of the long arm excavator. Furthermore HGVs access the site only via the existing access north of the B6271 (see Condition 19) and in doing so pass only a very limited number of residential properties due to the distance from the villages and movements would only be during reasonable working hours.
- 7.14 The updated noise conditions (see Conditions 3-7) take account of the PPG in respect of noise and have been drafted with the input from the District EHO. In addition the hours of working are defined by condition and would not extend beyond those previously permitted. It should be noted that Condition 17 reduces the hours of working in Phase 6 to a later start (08:00) and earlier finish (17:00) due to the proximity to Bolton Road residents. Noise from the quarry is monitored four times each year and this will continue during the remainder of its operation and secured by planning condition number 3. The requirement for all plant, machinery and vehicles used to be fitted with effective noise attenuating equipment which shall be regularly maintained shall be carried forward and where earth mobile plant is operating within Phase 6 non audible reverse warning alarm systems shall be deployed (see Condition 8).
- 7.15 Whilst the proposals would involve undertaking quarrying activity nearer to residential properties it should be noted that the continued workings would take place over a relatively short period, with total activity in phases 5 and 6 to completion of restoration occurring within a 3-4 year period. Relatively restricted hours are proposed to be worked to help minimise the potential impact and will continue to be the subject of conditions if planning permission is granted. In the absence of any objection from the Richmondshire Environmental Health Officer and subject to appropriate control and monitoring of noise, with a requirement for implementation of additional mitigation measures if necessary, it is not considered that any unacceptable impact due to noise would arise.
- 7.16 With regard to concerns raised about noise disturbance arising from the after use of the restored site it should be noted that the Long Term Management Plan dated May 2016 at section 2.1.4 states that phase 6 *"is to be restored to nature conservation and quiet amenity. The aim of the management plan is to facilitate the development of an ecologically diverse range of habitats while incorporating sensitively designed facilities for quiet recreation such as walking, jogging, fishing, horse-riding, cycling and similar non-motorised recreational activities"*. The Long Term Management Plan will continue to be secured through a legal agreement should permission be granted.
- 7.17 In light of the above it is considered that predicted noise levels arising from the development would remain within acceptable limits as defined in national planning guidance and the unavoidable noise from the site can be controlled and mitigated to minimise the impact in compliance with paragraph 144 of the NPPF and 'saved' policies 4/1(c&e) and 4/14 of the NYMLP (1997) and policy CP3(c) of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Local amenity (air quality)

- 7.18 The applicant has provided an air quality assessment within Chapter 12 of the ES. The assessment considers the site and surrounding area and existing air quality and the effect of meteorological conditions. It is noted that objections have made reference to concerns about air quality impacts arising from the continuation of operations in phases 5 and 6. The assessment also identifies the potential sources of dust and considers the emission magnitude and evaluates risk. It also sets out the proposed prevention and control mitigation measures.
- 7.19 The assessment highlights that for most of the time the extraction taking place in phase 5 and 6 will be underwater so the likelihood of generating dust is extremely limited. It is noted that dust can be generated from the movement of the minerals around the site and from earthworks operations, such as soil stripping and restoration. In terms of processing this will continue to be restricted to only taking place within the plant area in the northern part of the quarry (see Condition 12) which is away from residential properties.
- 7.20 It is proposed that a dust management plan (Condition 10) will outline the location and frequency of monitoring and the mitigation methods to be employed to reduce fugitive dust if it occurs. This includes, among other measures, the monitoring of dust using standard gauges, the method for dealing with dust complaints and the suspension of activities should dust control measures are insufficient at particularly windy times. Dust is currently monitored at the quarry and will continue to be monitored for the remainder of its working life. New dust monitoring locations are proposed nearer to the residential properties on Bolton Road and Scorton village as the point of extraction advances towards them. In response to a specific request from one of the objectors (see paragraph 5.3) the applicant has confirmed that they agree to the additional dust gauge.
- 7.21 With regard to the impacts on local air quality from traffic emissions it is noted that the application does not propose an increase in HGV traffic above the existing level and the traffic generated is not considered to be significant in terms of the air quality impact.
- 7.22 It is considered that the mitigation measures are appropriate and effective and it is recommended that Conditions 10-12 which relate to dust control are carried forward with any grant of planning permission. The potential for dust generating sources have been recognised and assessed and there have been no objections raised by the District EHO. It is considered that the dust can be sufficiently controlled and mitigated to minimise the impact in compliance with paragraph 144 of the NPPF and 'saved' policies 4/1(c&e) and 4/14 of the NYMLP (1997) and policy CP3(c&e) of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Highways matters

- 7.23 The ES includes an assessment (Chapter 13) of the impact of continued quarrying on various transport matters, including traffic flows on the B6271, impacts on public transport, cyclists and walkers, accident levels and the condition of the road.
- 7.24 The application confirms that there would be no changes to the volume, method and direction of traffic flows. There are currently approximately 75 HGVs entering the site each day (75 in, 75 out). While there is no condition in the existing planning permission that limits the number of HGV movements to and from the site, it is not proposed to increase HGV movements over current levels and the levels that the site saw prior to the recession. The HGVs gain access to the site off the B6271 from the dedicated quarry access (existing). When leaving the site, most turn to the west to join the A1(M) at Brompton on Swale or Catterick. No material from phases 5 and 6, which are south of the B6271, will exit the site other than by the existing quarry entrance on the northern side of the B6271. The existing road entrance into phase 5

on southern side of the B6271 was originally the old plant site. However, this entrance will only be used for occasional mobile plant movement and servicing.

- 7.25 The Local Highway Authority and Highways England have confirmed no objections to the proposal and there are no objections from the Parish Councils or local residents on highways grounds. The existing conditions which restrict HGV access to only via the existing access; require the access road to be kept clean and in a good condition; and the implementation of precautions to ensure HGVs leaving the site do not deposit mud or debris on the public highway ('Vehicle-borne debris management plan') shall be carried forward with any grant of planning permission (see Conditions 19 and 24-26).
- 7.26 This application would not lead to a material increase in traffic generation over that previously considered acceptable. The planning permission relating to the quarry combines operational controls and mitigation measures in order to ensure that the quarry operations are acceptable in terms of highways and transport and, where relevant, it is proposed to carry those controls forward with any grant of planning permission. In light of the above it is considered that the traffic generated can be accommodated and will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, capacity or amenity and complies with 'saved' policies 4/1(h) and 4/13 of the NYMLP (1997) and policy CP4(e) of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Public Access

- 7.27 There are several Public Rights of Way within the vicinity of the site and the 'Coast to Coast' Long Distance Footpath. The limit of extraction is unchanged from that previously approved and there would be no significant impacts to the Public Right of Way network as a result of the proposed extension of time and minor alterations to the direction of working reconfigured layout for the conveyor. The conveyor would run via an in-situ tunnel underneath the intervening minor road (Back Lane) so would not have a physical impact upon the existing public rights of ways which shall be protected and kept clear of any obstruction. The phasing shown on the drawing attached to this report at Appendix D indicates that the 'Coast to Coast' Long Distance Footpath has been diverted around Phases 5 and 6.
- 7.28 Progressive restoration of the quarry allows for phases to be restored as they are work thereby minimising the duration of disturbance and allowing for public recreational use of the restored areas in the shortest possible timeframe. The proposed restoration includes the provision of public footpaths around phases 5 & 6 as shown on the drawing attached to this report at Appendix E. The restored landscape of Phase 6 would comprise a lake with lake edge planting, open grazing, scrub and woodland, and a public bridleway along the west side of the lake. This would provide a valuable recreational landscape to the local area and have a beneficial effect on users of the 'Coast to Coast' footpath.
- 7.29 In light of the above, it is considered that the potential for conflict is limited and would not give rise to any unacceptable adverse impacts upon users of public rights of way in the area and complies with the NPPF and 'saved' policy 4/15 of the NYMLP (1997) and policies CP3(c), CP4(e) and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Landscape and visual impact

- 7.30 Chapter 6 of the ES assessed the landscape and visual implications of the proposal on the wider landscape and surrounding residential properties and assessed that there will in general be no significant adverse effects from continued operation of the quarry.



- 7.31 The quarry is not situated within or close to nationally designated landscape, and the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) has not identified any significant effects or cumulative effects on the local countryside as a result of future working of phases 5 and 6. The physical changes to landscape character result from the disturbance of the agricultural land and progressing of workings into phase 6. It is acknowledged that due to the existing topography, and the presence of existing vegetation between the application boundary and the nearest residential properties, any significant views of the workings in phase 6 are only likely to be available from upper floor windows. Phase 6 will be worked from the west to the east to allow screening of the quarry from the residential buildings located along its boundary on Bolton Road. During excavation temporary soil bunds will be constructed around the main hopper point on the conveyor to reduce visual and noise impact for residents of the properties on the eastern boundary. Furthermore there will be no material processing in phases 5 and 6.
- 7.32 In the longer term, the restoration proposals would involve the replacement of the existing agricultural land with a modified, lower level landform containing a lake with marginal planting. This would result in a permanent change to the local landscape but this is as per the restoration proposals previously approved, which involves the creation of a number of water bodies and associated amenity and nature conservation areas. In the longer term, this should also enhance the network of public access available generally within the restored quarry area.
- 7.33 Phase 5 has a relatively short operational period of approximately two years, and is relatively visually contained by virtue of surrounding higher landforms and boundary vegetation. The workings in phase 6 will be more open to view particular for residents on the west side of Bolton Road and for users of the Coast to Coast footpath. For these, the impact is assessed as “slight adverse”. However, the impact will be temporary during the extraction phase only and the resulting restoration of the site is considered to have significant beneficial impacts on the landscape character of this local area.
- 7.34 There are no objections from the County Principal Landscape Architect and overall, there are no significant landscape or visual effects predicted as a result of the continued operation of the site for a further 4 years. In terms of policy compliance, it is considered that the proposed screening could protect the environment and residential receptors from potential landscape and visual impacts and it is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with the NPPF and ‘saved’ policy 4/1(d) of the NYMLP (1997) and policies CP3(j), CP4(a) and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

- 7.35 This is assessed within Chapter 10 of the ES. There are no designated heritage assets within the application site. The boundary of two Conservation Areas are approximately 200 metres to the east of the quarry. In light of the intervening land, topography, bunds and planting it is considered that the continuation of mineral extraction would not have an adverse impact upon the setting of these heritage assets.
- 7.36 With regard to archaeology the two remaining phases of quarrying (phases 5 & 6) have already been stripped of their soils and subject to quarrying in the past and therefore it is unlikely that there will be any remaining archaeology in these areas. However, it is acknowledged that there is the possibility archaeological remains could be found in the edges of the extraction area, including in the soil slope to between the road and the extraction areas, possibly related to the Scorton Cursus (ditches) which lay to the north. Previously undiscovered archaeological remains could survive on the peripheral areas of Area 5 and a full assessment of the impact on these is included

and mitigation measures, including appropriate recording and preservation, or preservation in situ is proposed.

- 7.37 The County Archaeologist has confirmed that there are no objections to the extension of time, subject to the applicant undertaking archaeological recording as secured by a condition (Condition 39) included on any permission granted. In light of the above, it is considered that the impact of the proposal upon cultural heritage assets will be fully assessed and appropriate mitigation included in accordance with policy set down in respect of heritage assets within the NPPF and in compliance with policies CP3, CP4 and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Ecology

- 7.38 The ecological impact assessment in the ES (Chapter 7) demonstrates that continued quarrying can be undertaken without a likely significant effect on local ecology, protected species and designated sites. With appropriate mitigation and restoration measures, the assessment shows that residual effects (those continuing after extraction has ceased) will be at worst “minor to negligible significance”. The Swale Lakes SSSI to the south of phase 5 will experience a negligible impact from continued operation of the quarry. Natural England have advised that the SSSI does not represent a constraint in determining this application.
- 7.39 Significant beneficial outcomes are anticipated through the delivery on restoration of new habitats, including lakes, native species woodland planting, managed grazing land and scrub planting. The restoration scheme is assessed as likely to improve habitat value for key species including badgers, birds, butterflies and reptiles. Longer term management of the created or protected habitats is set out in the long after management plan (25 years) secured by a legal agreement which provides detailed information on the appropriate care for these habitats and for their long term management well beyond the operational life of the quarry.
- 7.40 The County Ecologist and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust are supportive of the proposals and the nature conservation restoration forms part of a Section 106 legal agreement, which provides for an aftercare management plan beyond the statutory 5 year period. It is considered that the development would safeguard sites of nature conservation interest and protected species and in the longer term restoration has the potential to enhance biodiversity in the area. It is therefore considered that the development would be in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 118 of the NPPF and comply with ‘saved’ policies 4/1(c) and 4/6a of the NYMLP (1997) and policies CP4(b) and CP12 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Flood risk and the water environment

- 7.41 Scorton Quarry is located on the floodplain of the River Swale which lies 50 metres to the west of phase 5 and the ES (Chapter 9) has assessed the potential impact on the water resources within the surrounding area. ‘Saved’ policy 4/10 of the NYMLP (1997) states that mineral extraction will only be permitted where it would not have an unacceptable impact on surface or groundwater resources.
- 7.42 The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which concludes that the risk of flooding is considered low. The site, the nearest residential properties and the surrounding road network all lie several metres above the height of the river and no change is proposed to the height of the banks of the river to result in an increase in flood potential in this area.
- 7.43 Although it is proposed to extract mineral from below the water table, it is not proposed to de-water the workings by pumping. Instead, mineral would be extracted directly from beneath the water table using a hydraulic excavator as is the case with the current workings (all phases being worked wet). The development should not therefore directly affect groundwater levels in the vicinity of the site. As the quarry

involves extraction of only superficial sand and gravel deposits, no discernible impact is forecast on the integrity of the underlying aquifers in the Sandstone, Magnesian limestone, Millstone Grit and Carboniferous limestone beds beneath.

- 7.44 Surface water at the quarry collects in the existing lakes and will continue to do so when the two new lakes in the remaining phases 5 and 6 are created. These lakes would have a considerable surface area and can accommodate relatively large fluctuations in surface water flow without significant difference to their average water levels. Water also collects in Scorton Lake to the north of the plant site (outside of the planning application boundary) where discharge is controlled via pumps into a drain leading to the River Swale. Water needed for processing the mineral is also taken from this lake and no changes are proposed as part of this application.
- 7.45 There have been concerns raised about the discharge of water into Scorton Lake causing the deposition of sediment in the lake and a reduction in capacity which may in turn increase flood risk in the area. Scorton Lake is outside of the application boundary but nevertheless on 30 November 2016 the applicant confirmed that the deposition of silt into Scorton Lake will cease and also that the pipe into Scorton Lake that can transfer silt in to the lake will be blocked. This will be secured by Condition 47. The silt will be diverted to be used in the restoration of the lakes and landform in phases 2 and 4.
- 7.46 The characteristics of the local water environment are such that the effects of continued mineral extraction and associated water management are considered to be acceptable. The existing condition which relates to ground and surface water monitoring would be carried forward on any grant of planning permission (see Condition 2). The Environment Agency and the NYCC SUDs Officer have no objections to the application and it is considered that it would not give rise to any unacceptable adverse impacts upon the water environment and complies with the NPPF and 'saved' policy 4/10 of the NYMLP (1997) and policy CP3(e&g) and CP4(d) of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Soils, Restoration and Aftercare

- 7.47 The majority of the remaining area to be extracted has already been worked as a quarry and the soils replaced. The soils within phases 5 and 6 will have to be stripped and either stored for replacement once quarrying has finished or used to help create the edges of the resulting two lakes. Of the total remaining area to be worked only 2 hectares of good agricultural land will be lost, the remainder being of poorer quality agricultural ranking.
- 7.48 There will be a continuation of good practice in terms of the handling of soils during stripping and their storage prior to restoration at the end of extraction to ensure their long term integrity and viability for future habitat creation in the restoration scheme. This will continue to be secured by planning condition (see Condition 23). No additional soils are required to be imported.
- 7.49 The proposed restoration plan showing phases 5 & 6 is attached to this report at Appendix E with the anticipated timescales for completion shown at Appendix F. The site is to be restored to a mixture of conservation habitats, including grazed open parkland, lakes, marginal vegetation, wet woodland and neutral grassland. The restoration plan confirms the final shape of the lakes, the lake edge planting, the nature of habitat creation on the land surrounding the lakes and the provision of public footpaths. In addition it is proposed that existing hedgerows and woodland will be enhanced. The restoration design and implementation is guided by the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan which incorporates a bird management plan which influences the size, shape and edge profiling of the remaining lakes.

- 7.50 The restored site will be subject to the statutory 5 year aftercare period after which the applicant has committed to longer term management of the site for a further 25 years by an appropriate body for nature conservation, public access and recreation. This was detailed in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 management plans secured by Section 106 legal agreement (referred to in paragraphs 2.8 & 2.9 of this report) which are now incorporated into the Long Term Management Plan which has been updated to reflect the progress of restoration at the quarry.
- 7.51 The closure of the quarry would not allow the approved restoration scheme to be completed in its entirety and whilst it is acknowledged that paragraph 144 of the NPPF supports “*restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity*” it also requires it to be “*carried out to high environmental standards*”.
- 7.52 In granting the previous permissions there was a recognition of the benefits of the restoration scheme proposed by the applicant. This application does not alter the restoration scheme but would allow for its completion in full after which it would be subject to the previously agreed aftercare management period. There are no objections from the County Principal Landscape Architect, County Ecologist, Natural England or the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and there are opportunities to review mitigation and restoration progress via the Section 106 legal agreement. It is therefore considered that the proposed restoration on the site can be achieved to a high standard and would be subject to extended aftercare management and complies with the NPPF and ‘saved’ policies 4/1(f&g) and 4/20 of the NYMLP (1997) and policies CP3, CP4, CP12 and CP13(a&b) of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

#### Planning Conditions

- 7.53 All previous conditions shall remain albeit updated to reflect the development proposed by this application and any schemes approved under conditions since the grant of permission ref. C1/39/34G. Conditions which required works in earlier phases of the development which are no longer relevant have not been carried forward in light of the works having been completed.
- 7.54 The conditions which were previously prefaced by words to the effect of “*unless otherwise agreed in writing...*” (known as ‘open’ or ‘tailpiece’ conditions) have been updated to remove such wording so to avoid revisions to the original approved documents or authorising development outside of the formal planning application process.

#### Section 106 Legal Agreement

- 7.55 The existing Section 106 legal agreement dated 23 January 2004 secured the continuation and revision of the covenants contained within the ‘Original Agreement’ attached to permission C1/39/34E dated 18 November 2002. The ‘Original Agreement’ from 2002 covered the long term aftercare management of the restored site (nature conservation and recreational use areas) for a period of 25 years after expiry of the final aftercare period (5 years) in the form of Tier 1 (for Phase 1) and Tier 2 (for Phases 2-6) Management Plans. It also required cessation of mineral extraction in the old planning permission areas of Tancred Quarry, removal of the processing plant at Tancred Quarry and the establishment of a Local Community Liaison Group. The 2004 agreement carried those items forward with the addition of the diversion of the Coast to Coast public right of way, interim management of land adjoining the River Swale and details of bird management and control.
- 7.56 If planning permission is granted the Section 106 legal agreement would need to be updated and carried forward with the new permission as a deed of variation. In this case a deed of variation would be appropriate to carry forward the clauses still relevant such as the Local Community Liaison Group, bird management and the long term aftercare management of the restored site.

## 8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 The proposal does not seek to increase the overall footprint of the site or deviate from any other aspect of the consented operation, other than extending the time period for extraction with minor amendments to the phasing, direction of working and conveyor layout. The proposal does not seek to increase the output tonnage from the quarry, nor does it seek to amend the principle of the restoration scheme previously consented. The proposal would ensure the continued supply of the remaining sand and gravel within the existing quarry area and would allow for appropriate final site restoration. It is considered that the remaining reserves can be extracted without unacceptable harm and this would avoid the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource.
- 8.2 In considering this application Officers have been mindful of any material changes in planning circumstances since the original permission, including the publication of the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and current Local policies. The proposal would ensure the continued supply of sand and gravel to market in line with national policy and guidance on maintaining adequate landbanks. The development is supported in principle and there have been no significant material changes in terms of scale, nature or methods of working since the previous grant of planning permission which would result in the development having an unacceptable impact upon landscape character, heritage assets, ecology, local amenity, the water environment or highways. It is considered that any adverse impacts can be adequately mitigated by way of Conditions and through a Section 106 legal agreement (deed of variation). There are no material planning considerations to warrant the refusal of this application for the variation of condition No's 1, 20, 23 & 52 of planning permission ref. C1/39/34G to allow the continuation of sand and gravel extraction for a further 4 year period until 31 December 2020 with final restoration by 31 December 2021 and removal of the plant site by 31 December 2022 and amendments to the phasing and direction of working and a reconfigured layout for the conveyor.

## 9.0 Recommendation

9.1 For the following reasons:

- i) The development is in accordance with 'saved' policies 4/1, 4/6a, 4/10, 4/13, 4/14, 4/15 and 4/20 of the North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan (1997), and with Policies CP1, CP3, CP4, CP7, CP12 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and overall is consistent with the NPPF (2012);
- ii) The proposal does not conflict with the abovementioned policies as it is considered that the existing highway network is capable of handling the volume of traffic generated by the development, the visual impact of the proposed development can be mitigated through condition, the environmental impacts of the proposed development can be controlled by condition, the impact on neighbouring residential properties can be mitigated and adverse impacts are outweighed when considered against the existing infrastructure, markets and employment at the site along with the final completion of restoration proposals and there are no other material considerations indicating a refusal in the public interest;
- iii) The imposition of planning conditions will further limit the impact of the development on the environment, residential amenity the transport network and restoration and aftercare; and
- iv) Having taken into account all the environmental information submitted as part of this planning application included within the Environmental Statement

That, subject to prior completion of a deed of variation relating to the existing Section 106 Legal Agreement **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application details dated 10 January 2001 (as amended) (Ref C1/39/34E) and as amended by the application dated 11 April 2003 (Ref C1/39/34G) and as further amended by the application dated 9 June 2016 and the 'Approved Documents' as listed at the end of this Decision Notice together with the conditions attached to this Decision Notice which shall in all cases take precedence.

*Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application details.*

2. Within 3 months of the date of this permission a detailed scheme of ground and surface water monitoring shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority and such scheme shall include details of the following matters:-
  - a) the location and type of ground and surface water monitoring facilities installed;
  - b) the duration and frequency of monitoring to be carried out;
  - c) the ground and surface water perimeters to be monitored; and
  - d) the submission of monitoring results to the Mineral Planning Authority.

Thereafter, monitoring shall take place in accordance with the approved scheme.

*Reason: To safeguard the ground and surface water environment.*

3. Within 3 months of the date of this permission a scheme for monitoring of noise emitted from the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority. Such scheme as may be approved in writing by the County Planning Authority shall indicate the location of all monitoring stations, identify the LA90 levels at each station, incorporate as appropriate those receptors and LA90 levels obtained in the Environmental Statement (see Figure 11.1 dated December 2015) and provide for monitoring to be carried out at the approved locations at three monthly intervals. Between quarterly noise surveys additional monitoring shall be carried out at the written request of the County Planning Authority. All results shall be available for inspection on request by the County Planning Authority and the annual summary of results shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for consideration not later than 1 March in the following calendar year.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

4. The equivalent continuous noise level due to operations at the quarry during day time hours (0700-1900) shall not exceed the background noise level (LA90) by more than 10dB(A) at any residential premises. Measurements shall be hourly LAeq measurements and be corrected for the effects of extraneous noise. In any event, the total noise from the operations should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field).

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

5. Noise levels due to operations during the night-time period (06.00 – 07.00) shall not exceed 42dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field) at any residential premises..

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

6. Notwithstanding the noise limits imposed within Conditions 4 & 5 a temporary daytime noise limit of up to 70 dB(A) LAeq,1hour (free-field) at any residential premises is permitted for up to 8 weeks in a calendar year to facilitate essential site preparation and restoration work such as soil-stripping, the construction and removal of baffle mounds, soil storage mounds and spoil heaps, construction of new permanent landforms and aspects of site road construction and maintenance.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

7. In the event that noise monitoring indicates that any noise levels specified in Conditions 4 & 5 are exceeded, those operations at the site causing the excessive noise shall cease immediately and steps taken to attenuate the noise level to ensure compliance with the provisions of Conditions 4 & 5.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

8. All plant, machinery and vehicles used on any part of the site shall be fitted with effective noise attenuating equipment which shall be regularly maintained. Where earth mobile plant is operating within Phase 6 non audible reverse warning alarm systems shall be deployed.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

9. No fixed plant shall be erected within the site until full details of its siting, design and appearance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

10. Within 3 months of the date of this permission a Dust Management Plan for controlling and monitoring suspended and deposited dust emitted from the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority. Such scheme as may be approved in writing by the County Planning Authority shall identify types of monitors and the location of monitoring stations (including, but not limited to, those locations shown on Figure 12.2, dated December 2015), together with the mitigation measures to be implemented to control dust and such scheme shall thereafter be implemented so as to provide for the monitoring results from those stations to be made available at three monthly intervals. All results shall be available for inspection on request by the County Planning Authority and the annual summary of results shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for consideration not later than 1 March in the following calendar year.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

11. In the event that an assessment of dust emissions and/or the results of formal monitoring indicate that reasonable additional control measures are required to minimise emissions, proposals for such measures shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority. Measures subsequently approved in writing by the County Planning Authority shall be implemented within such a period as may be required by the County Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

12. No mineral processing shall take place at any location within the site except within the proposed processing plant area identified on the application drawings.

- Reason: To reserve the rights of control of the County Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.*
13. No dewatering of the working area hereby permitted shall take place.
- Reason: In the interests of amenity.*
14. No aggregate shall be imported into the site except in accordance with such scheme as may be agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority.
- Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.*
15. No operations or development hereby permitted shall take place within the proposed fixed processing plant area except between the following hours:-
- 0600 – 1900 Monday to Friday  
0600 – 1400 Saturday
- Reason: In the interests of amenity.*
16. Except as required by Condition 17 below, no mineral extraction or associated removal or replacement of soil or overburden shall take place except between the following hours:-
- 0700 – 1800 Monday to Friday  
0700 – 1300 Saturday
- Reason: In the interests of amenity.*
17. Within the Phase 6 working area as shown on the Phasing Plan drawing ref. NT12052/003, (dated December 2015) no operations shall take place except between the following hours:-
- 0800 - 1700 Monday to Friday  
0800 – 1300 Saturday
- Reason: In the interests of amenity.*
18. Notwithstanding the provisions of Conditions 15 and 16 and except for the area referred to in Condition 17 above, essential maintenance work only shall be permitted between the additional hours of 1300 – 1700 on Saturdays and 0800 – 1700 on Sundays.
- Reason: In the interests of amenity.*
19. No vehicular access to the site from the public highway shall be gained except via the existing access to Scorton Quarry, except as necessary for the purposes of delivery, removal and maintenance of essential plant to that part of the site to the south of the B6271.
- Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.*
20. Mineral extraction shall proceed only in accordance with the phasing arrangements and direction of working indicated on the 'Phasing Plan' drawing ref NT12052/003, dated December 2015.
- Reason: To reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.*



21. The method of working and type of plant to be used for mineral working shall only be in accordance with the details set out in the planning application and accompanying information.

*Reason: To reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.*

22. No mineral shall be transported from Phases 5 & 6 to the processing plant area except in accordance with the details set out in the 'Phasing Plan' drawing ref NT12052/003, dated December 2015 which details the routing of the conveyor system and the locations of the conveyer transfer points.

*Reason: To reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.*

23. All soils shall be stripped, stored, handled and reused for restoration purposes in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in Section 8.6 of the Environmental Statement dated May 2016.

*Reason: To safeguard the soil resources.*

24. The access route from the quarry to the public highway shall be kept clean and maintained in a good standard of repair, free of potholes for the life of the operations. The access shall be maintained such that surface water from the site does not discharge onto the existing highway. Details of any proposed new gates, barriers, signage and landscaping works at the site entrance shall be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority and such works shall be implemented only in accordance with the details so approved.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety.*

25. All facilities for access, parking (staff and visitors), turning, manoeuvring, loading and unloading of all vehicles using the site shall be maintained clear of any obstruction and retained for their intended purpose at all times for the duration of the development.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.*

26. The precautions to be taken and to prevent the deposition of mud on public highways by vehicles travelling from the site shall be implemented in accordance with mitigation measures set out in Section 3 of the 'Vehicle-borne debris management plan' ref. NT12052 Report 001, dated September 2016. Such precautions shall be maintained in full working order for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.*

27. No mineral extraction or other works involving the alteration of existing ground levels shall take place within 50 metres of the top of the River Swale.

*Reason: To ensure the stability of the bank of the River Swale.*

28. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If

there is multiple tankage, the compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the interconnected tanks plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and site glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any water course, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge downwards into the bunds.

*Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.*

29. The final profile of the restored lake margins shall not exceed the following maximum gradients:-

- i. Phase 5: 10 metres at 1 in 20 followed by 15 metres at 1 in 10.
- ii. Phase 6: 10 metres at 1 in 10 followed by 5 metres at 1 in 5.
- iii. Phases 1, 2, 3, 4: 10 metres at 1 in 5.

*Reason: In the interests of public safety and the nature conservation interest of the site.*

30. Appropriate fencing shall be erected and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted so as to prevent unintentional access to all operational areas.

*Reason: In the interests of public safety.*

31. Appropriate warning signs shall be erected and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted advising of the presence of operational areas and water bodies.

*Reason: In the interests of public safety.*

32. Within 6 months of the date of this permission a detailed scheme of public access shall be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority and such scheme shall include details of:-

- i. All necessary temporary and permanent diversions of public rights of way.
- ii. Any proposed permissive access.
- iii. The provision to be made for disabled access.
- iv. The car parking provision to serve the restored land.
- v. The protection of public rights of way for the duration for the development.

*Reason: To safeguard public access during the development.*

33. Bird control measures relating to the water bodies created/to be created shall be implemented in accordance with the Bird Management Strategy contained within Section 3 of the Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan dated May 2016.

*Reason: To minimise the risk of bird strike hazard to aircraft.*

34. All vehicles transporting mineral from the site shall be securely sheeted so that no material may be spilled on the public highway.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity.*

35. Details of any proposed new external site lighting shall be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority prior to installation and site lighting shall subsequently take place only in accordance with the details so approved.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

36. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015, no fixed plant, machinery or buildings shall be erected at the site except as provided for in the application details, without the prior written approval of the County Planning Authority.

*Reason: To reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.*

37. Throughout the period of working, restoration and aftercare the operator shall protect and support any ditch, watercourse or culvert passing through the site or satisfactorily divert it so as not to impair the flow or render less effective drainage onto and from adjoining land.

*Reason: To prevent damage and pollution to water resources and off-site drainage including that of agricultural land.*

38. All operational and unrestored areas of the site and all topsoil, subsoil and overburden mounds shall be kept free from pernicious and invasive weeds and such measures as may be necessary shall be taken to control weed growth and prevent the production of seed and subsequent spread of agricultural weeds onto adjoining land.

*Reason: In the interests of safeguarding agricultural land.*

39. Archaeological mitigation, recording, reporting and dissemination shall be undertaken in accordance with parts 10.15 & 10.16 (Chapter 10) of the Environmental Statement dated May 2016 with copies of reports provided to the County Planning Authority upon completion.

*Reason: The site is of archaeological importance.*

40. Progressive restoration, landscaping and planting shall be implemented in accordance with the 'Anticipated restoration phasing' drawing ref NT12052/006, dated March 2016 and the Tier 2 Restoration Plan drawing ref NT12052/004 Rev A, dated March 2016 and the 'Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan' (Appendix 3.1 of the ES) dated May 2016.

*Reason: To ensure satisfactory restoration.*

41. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Scheme for the Protection of Established Trees & Hedges within Phases 4, 5 & 6 September 2016 (Amended January 2017) and planting shall be protected and maintained throughout the duration of the operational period, and thereafter as part of restoration aftercare.

*Reason: In the interests of amenity.*

42. The establishment and aftercare maintenance and management of restored areas shall be undertaken in accordance with the 'Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan' (Appendix 3.1 of the ES) dated May 2016 for a period of 5 years from completion of restoration in each phase.

*Reason: To ensure satisfactory restoration and beneficial after use of the site.*

43. In the event of mineral extraction ceasing on the site for a period in excess of 12 months before the completion of the development hereby permitted, a revised scheme of restoration, landscaping and aftercare shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for written approval within 18 months of the cessation. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with a programme to be included in that scheme.

*Reason: To ensure restoration is undertaken as soon as practicable in the interests of amenity.*

44. Every 12 months from the date of this permission or at such other times as may be agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority, a review of the previous years planting, working, restoration and aftercare shall be carried out in conjunction with a representative of the County Planning Authority. The review shall take account of any departure from the scheme approved under the terms of this permission and a revised scheme shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval providing for the taking of such steps as may be necessary to continue the satisfactory landscaping, working, restoration and aftercare of the site including the replacement of any tree or shrub which may have died, been removed or become seriously damaged or diseased. Thereafter all such work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schemes.

*Reason: To secure an orderly and progressive pattern of working of the site.*

45. A copy of the planning permission and any agreed variations, together with all the approved plans, shall be kept available at the site office at all times.

*Reason: To ensure that site personnel are aware of the terms of the planning permission.*

46. The permission hereby granted authorises the extraction of minerals only until 31 December 2020. The development hereby permitted shall be discontinued and all plant and machinery associated with the extraction of minerals shall be removed from the site and the site restored in accordance with the application details and the requirements of this Decision Notice by 31 December 2021 with the removal and restoration of the plant site by 31 December 2022.

*Reason: To reserve the rights of control by the County Planning Authority to ensure restoration of the land with the minimum of delay in the interests of amenity.*

47. Within 1 month of the date of this permission details to evidence that the necessary measures have been implemented to ensure that the deposition of silt into Scorton Lake arising from operations at Scorton Quarry has ceased shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for written approval. Such measures shall be maintained in full working order for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

*Reason: In the interests of reducing potential flood risk in the area.*

Approved Documents

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Title</b>
NT12052	May 2016	Environmental Statement & Figures & Appendices
NT12052/002	December 2015	Site Boundary S136 00126
NT12052/003	December 2015	Phasing Plan S136 00099

NT12052/004 Rev A	March 2016	Tier 2 Restoration Plan S136 00105
NT12052/005	March 2016	Restoration progress to end of 2016 S136 00127
NT12052/006	March 2016	Anticipated restoration phasing S136 00128
NT12052	May 2016	Restoration and Aftercare Management Plan (incorporating Bird Management Plan)
NT12052	May 2016	Long Term Management Plan (incorporating Tier 1 & Tier 2 management plans)
NT12052 Report 001	September 2016	Vehicle-borne Debris Management Plan
---	September 2016 (Amended January 2017)	Scheme for the Protection of Established Trees & Hedges within Phases 4, 5 & 6
S136/TS16/01	24/01/2017	Tree Survey with Root Protection Radius- Phase 4
S136/TS16/02	24/01/2017	Tree Survey with Root Protection Radius- Phase 5
S136/TS16/03	24/01/2017	Tree Survey with Root Protection Radius- Phase 6

**Statement of Compliance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning  
(Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015**

*In determining this planning application, the County Planning Authority has worked with the applicant adopting a positive and proactive manner. The County Council offers the opportunity for pre-application discussion on applications and the applicant, in this case, chose to take up this service. Proposals are assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework, Replacement Local Plan policies and Supplementary Planning Documents, which have been subject to proactive publicity and consultation prior to their adoption. During the course of the determination of this application, the applicant has been informed of the existence of all consultation responses and representations made in a timely manner which provided the applicant/agent with the opportunity to respond to any matters raised. The County Planning Authority has sought solutions to problems arising by liaising with consultees, considering other representations received and liaising with the applicant as necessary. Where appropriate, changes to the proposal were sought when the statutory determination timescale allowed.*


DAVID BOWE  
Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services

Author of report: Alan Goforth


Background Documents to this Report:

1. Planning Application Ref Number: C1/16/00507/CM (NY/2016/0094/ENV) registered as valid on 21 June 2016. Application documents can be found on the County Council's Online Planning Register by using the following web link:  
<https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/register/>
2. Consultation responses received.
3. Representations received.


Appendix A- Site Location and constraints



Appendix B- Site Location and representations




Appendix C- Aerial Photo






Appendix D- Phasing Plan (Phases 5 & 6)



Appendix E- Restoration Plan (Phase 5 & 6)



Appendix F- Anticipated Restoration Phasing



**North Yorkshire County Council**

**Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee**

**04 April 2017**

**Items Dealt With Under the Scheme Of Delegation**

**Report of the Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services**

**The Items reported below have been determined between:  
09 January to 06 March Inclusive**

**A. COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT**

**NY/2017/0011/A27**

**Killinghall Church of England Primary  
School, Crag Lane, Killinghall, HG3 2DW**

Decision Letter: 27 February 2017

Application for the approval of details reserved by condition No. 14 of Planning Permission Ref. C6/16/01468/CMA which relates to a Lighting Assessment

Details APPROVED

**NY/2016/0254/A27**

**Fisher Lodge, Hookstone Drive, Harrogate,  
HG2 8PT**

Decision Letter: 26 January 2017

Application for the approval of details reserved by condition No's 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of Planning Permission Ref. C6/15/05225/CM which relates to landscaping, tree protection plan, details of proposed doors and windows to be blocked off, parking arrangements and fencing details

Details APPROVED

**C1/16/00972/CM (NY/2016/0253/73A)**

**Hipswell Church of England Primary School,  
Hipswell, Catterick Garrison, North  
Yorkshire, DL9 4BB**

Decision Notice: 10 February 2017

Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 1648 (71 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**NY/2016/0248/NMT**

**Killinghall Church of England Primary  
School, Crag Lane, Killinghall, HG3 2DW**

Decision Letter: 18 January 2017

Application for non-material minor amendments for alterations to the south east and eastern external elevation to be rendered masonry, with additional composite panels to be added to the south east external elevation, external store to be changed to rendered masonry, the width of 2 external doors to be amended, relocation of the cycle shelter, amendments to fencing type and planting relating to planning application Ref. C6/16/01468/CMA

Details APPROVED

**C2/16/02842/CCC (NY/2016/0238/73A)**      **Northallerton College, Grammar School Lane, Northallerton, DL6 1DD**

Decision Notice: 13 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 3527 (131 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C4/16/02452/CC (NY/2016/0236/73A)**      **Wykeham Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School, Wykeham, Scarborough, YO13 9QB**

Decision Notice: 16 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 1671 (76 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C4/16/02398/CC (NY/2016/0232/73A)**      **Filey Junior School, West Road, Filey, North Yorkshire, YO14 9LU**

Decision Notice: 16 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom units 1497 (71 sq. metres) & 1498 (74 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C3/16/01905/CPO (NY/2016/0231/73A)**      **Sheriff Hutton Primary School, West End, Sheriff Hutton, York, YO60 6SH**

Decision Notice: 12 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 0982 (76 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C4/16/02379/CC (NY/2016/0229/73A)**      **Overdale Community Primary School, Hawthorne Walk, Eastfield, Scarborough, YO11 3HW**

Decision Notice: 12 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 0961 (78 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C4/16/02390/CC (NY/2016/0228/73A)**      **Northstead CP School, Maple Drive, Scarborough, North Yorkshire, YO12 6LP**

Decision Notice: 12 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 0881 (75 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C4/16/02391/CC (NY/2016/0227/73A)**      **Braeburn Infant & Nursery School, Braeburn, Eastfield, Scarborough, YO11 3LG**

Decision Notice: 12 January 2017  
Retention of prefabricated classroom unit 0847 (64 sq. metres) for a further 6 years

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C3/16/01912/CPO (NY/2016/0226/LBC)**      **Slingsby Community Primary School, The Green, Slingsby, Malton, YO62 4AA**

Decision Notice: 16 February 2017

Change of use of existing school house (Use Class C3) to Non Residential Institution (Use Class D1) with external internal alterations to a single doorset, internal alterations to provide classroom at ground floor level and an office space at first floor level (99.16 sq. metres)

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT GRANTED

**C3/16/01911/CPO (NY/2016/0223/FUL)**      **Slingsby Community Primary School, The Green, Slingsby, Malton, YO62 4AA**

Decision Notice: 16 February 2017

Change of use of existing school house (Use Class C3) to Non Residential Institution (Use Class D1) with external internal alterations to a single doorset, internal alterations to provide classroom at ground floor level and an office space at first floor level (99.16 sq. metres)

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C2/16/02799/CCC (NY/2016/0170/FUL)**      **Romanby Primary School, The Close, Northallerton, North Yorkshire, DL7 8BL**

Decision Notice: 16 January 2017

Erection of a steel framed wooden outdoor covered stage (37 sq. metres) with access ramp (6 sq. metres) and 10 wooden seats

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**C1/16/00824/CM (NY/2016/0144/FUL)**      **Colburn Community Primary School, Colburn Lane, Colburn, DL9 4LS**

Decision Notice: 02 March 2017

Construction of a single storey extension (249 sq. metres) to provide 2 No. classrooms, associated cloakrooms and toilets, refurbishment of 2 classrooms, hard landscaping and pathways (715 sq. metres) relocation of existing Multi-Use Games area with 3 m high weldmesh fencing (448 sq. metres) and soft landscaping works

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

**NY/2014/0331/A30**      **Land to the north of Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bar**

Decision Letter: 24 January 2017

Application for the approval of details reserved by condition No's 19, 20, 21, 22 & 23 of Planning Permission Ref C2/13/01600/CCC which relates to details of the routes to be used by HCV construction traffic, precautions to be taken to prevent the deposit of mud, grit and dirt on the public highways, Construction Method Statement, Dust Management and Construction Environmental Management Plan

Details APPROVED

**C1/16/00847/CM (NY/2016/0175/FUL)**      **Le Cateau CP School, Le Cateau Road, Catterick Garrison, DL9 4ED**

Decision Notice: 01 March 2017

Construction of a single storey extension (394 sq. metres) to provide 3 No. classrooms, entrance lobby, associated cloakrooms and toilets with 12 photovoltaic panels, playground and hardstanding (1,156 sq. metres), 20 No. cycle racks, creation of footpaths and paving (230 sq. metres), erection of 1.5 metre high (12 metres) low level blue brick and render retaining wall, tree removal, external works and soft landscaping

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

## **B. COUNTY MATTER DEVELOPMENT**

### **NY/2016/0193/SCO**

### **Newthorpe Quarry, Newthorpe, Sherburn in Elmet**

Scoping Opinion Issued: 24 January 2017

Request for an EIA Scoping Opinion for recommencement of quarry operations and a new access road

SCOPING OPINION ISSUED

### **C1/16/00881/CM (NY/2016/0192/FUL)**

### **Middleton Lodge, Kneeton Lane, Middleton Tyas, DL10 6NJ**

Decision Notice: 28 February 2017

Part retrospective planning application for the storage of soil mounds for the duration of the mineral extraction works at Middleton Lodge Quarry, Kneeton Lane, Richmond Planning Permission Ref No. C1/14/00747/CM for use in restoration by 15th May 2028

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED subject to conditions

### **NY/2016/0084/A27**

### **Land to the South of Alne Brickworks, Forest Lane, Alne, YO61 1TU**

Decision Letter: 20 January 2017

Application for the approval of details reserved by condition No's 4, 14, 18, 19 & 20 of Planning Permission Ref. C2/14/01410/CCC which relates to a Written Scheme of Investigation, a detailed surface water drainage strategy, a detailed landscape strategy and maintenance programme, an outline restoration management strategy including a monitoring & management plan & an outline scheme of aftercare

Details APPROVED

### **NY/2013/0399/A30**

### **Copley Lane Landfill, St Johns Lane, Sherburn in Elmet, LS25 6BJ**

Decision Letter: 26 January 2017

Application for the discharge of Condition No. 3 of Planning Permission Reference No. C8/66/47K/PA which relates to the restoration and aftercare scheme

Details APPROVED

### **C8/45/13AB/PA (NY/2010/0317/MRP)**

### **Went Edge Quarry, Smeaton Industrial Estate, Kirk Smeaton**

Decision Letter: 26 January 2017

Application for the review of conditions to which IDO permission (Old Mineral Permission) Planning Permission No. C8/45/13K/IDO applies

Details APPROVED

To access the planning application details, consultation responses and a copy of the report and decision notice containing any planning conditions relevant to the development please access the County Council's Online Planning Register at the following web address:

<https://onlineplanningregister.northyorks.gov.uk/register/PlanAppSrch.aspx>

(Please enter the planning application reference number (NY/...) into the 'Application Reference' field).

DAVID BOWE  
Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services

Author of Report: Steph Christon

Background Documents: None