

## **Stanton Moor Mineral Liaison Group (SMMLG)**

### **Draft minutes of meeting held on Monday 19 October 2015**

#### **Members Present**

Prof Tony Crook – Chair

Paul Morris – Stanton in Peak Parish Council (SF), in place of (PM)

Andy Tickle – Friends of the Peak District (AT)

Howard Griffith – Stanton against the destruction of our environment (SADE) (HG)

Geoffrey Henson – Stanton Lees Action Group (SLAG) (GH)

Iain Kennedy – Blockstone Ltd (IK)

Steve Boam Stancliffe Stone Ltd (SB)

Adrian Davie-Thornhill – Thornhill Settlement (ADT)

Roger Caisley - Birchover Stone Ltd (RC)

#### **In attendance**

John Scott – PDNPA Director of Planning (JRS) (also acting as minutes clerk)

Jane Newman – PDNPA Senior Minerals Planner (JEN)

#### **1. Apologies**

Apologies had been received from the following:

Kath Potter – Rowsley PC

Andrew Gregory (Blockstone Ltd)

The following members did not attend:

Haddon Estates

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest at this meeting.

#### **3. Chair's Report**

The Chair **reported** that he had attended the Authority's Planning Committee on 7 August 2015 and spoken to the Committee when they considered the report John Scott had prepared which accompanied the Group's minutes. The committee supported the continuation of the Liaison Group.

The Chair also reported that he was chairing the review of the governance of Rotherham Council which was part of the proposed combined authority that included Derbyshire Dales, but that this did not conflict with his work with the Liaison group.

HG stated that he had not received the minutes from the meeting in June or the papers for this meeting until he chased them.

The Chair said that an email he had sent to HG in August with the report to the Planning Committee and minutes had bounced back so he re-sent them to another email address which had been provided by PNPA staff.

JRS said that he had personally send the minutes to all those who had attended in June and it had not “bounced back”. He was not aware that HG had changed his email address.

HG requested that his gmail address be used for correspondence.

#### **4. Approval of minutes of last meeting (29 June 2015)**

The minutes were **agreed** as an accurate record, subject to the second point under matters arising (below)

#### **5. Matters Arising**

- Cllr Kath Potter – The Chair noted that Cllr Potter has only attended the first meeting of the Group, but he had been advised that the Authority’s Democratic Services Officer advice was that there is no “three strikes “ rule for liaison groups (i.e. about the continuing membership of Authority committees and groups if members missed three or more meetings). The Chair advised the Group that Cllr Potter had not been present at the August Planning Committee but a statement had been read out on her behalf and that he had responded to this at the Committee and corrected what had been said
- HG queried the minutes in respect of what JRS had said in relation to Dale View Quarry, stating that JRS had said something other than what was minuted. It was agreed that this would be clarified in that part of the agenda.

#### **6. Dale View Quarry**

##### **a. Wire Saw Bases**

JEN reported that officers had met with Stancliffe Stone recently and had received a letter (13 October) from the company, which could be reported to the Group. The Company stated that they did not intend to challenge the appeal decision on the wire saws and that they were looking into their options for the unauthorised bases. Two options had been suggested in the letter – to break up the bases and remove them, or to cover them up in situ. JEN had declined to comment at this stage.

HG asked if the letter was available - JEN advised that it was now in the public domain and would be circulated.

ADT asked why the retention of the bases would be a problem.

HG challenged this and referred back to the original quarry permission

SB explained that the bases are not visible from the road. He asked the group to comment on the idea of retaining part of the crane bases to reuse for cab cleaning.

Removal of the bases would create additional noise and traffic. JEN said that the retention of the bases could not be justified simply on the basis that they were there.

A discussion followed about the merits of removal as compared to retention and/or covering up.

JRS explained that the PDNPA has to respond to any proposal on its merits, rather than taking a punitive approach to unauthorised development.

SB apologised for the unauthorised work and offered to show people around the site to look at the bases if they wished.

b. Amendment to Planning Permission NP/DDD/0606/0316

JEN explained that she had a meeting with the Company's agents the next day to discuss the terms of the permission, specifically a bond. She should then be in a position to issue the decision.

HG asked for a report on which conditions were being changed (see JRS action on last minutes). JRS explained that the Committee report in 2013 had explained what was proposed

JEN offered to do something in response to this.

GH not happy with "ignored" conditions. JEN gave an example of a condition which had not been complied with and was therefore not being re-imposed, but which was no longer necessary (deer fencing)

The Chair thought this was a good offer from JEN and then explained how the Authority deals with matters of expediency and judgement in enforcing and discharging conditions.

PM said that he wants "equitability" in such matters rather than the impression that big companies can "get away with it".

In conclusion it was **agreed** that JEN would circulate a copy of the new draft conditions when available, the old conditions and the most recent site monitoring report.

c. New workshop building current colour

JEN reported that the workshop had now been painted in the agreed colour so this was now resolved to the PDNPAs satisfaction. SB said that it is a green/brown in matt.

d. Unauthorised stocking at Rowsley Woodyard

JEN explained that this had been discussed with the company at the recent meeting and the company is looking at its options but accepts that it needs to be addressed.

HG mentioned other unauthorized storage of stone in the area. JRS explained that this is probably related to the surfacing of tracks by Haddon Estates – this may have permission (in association with forestry works) or may not need permission if it is for the improvement

of existing tracks. HG also mentioned other works near New Pilhough which were the subject of a planning application and which had caused local concern.

The Chair asked members to report any activity they are uncertain about to the PDNPA so that the Authority can check whether it is unauthorised. JRS and JEN endorsed this.

The Chair also asked if officers could produce a note on agricultural permitted development. JRS advised that the Authority is offering planning training to Parish Councils which could cover this.

AT asked whether Minerals enforcement was separate from general planning enforcement – JRS confirmed that it is (The Minerals team carry out their own monitoring and enforcement).

d. Steve Boam gave a short update on operations at Dale View – currently working on the restoration of the outer rim.

## **7. Stanton Moor/New Pilhough**

JEN advised that the appeal against the refusal of an earlier application, based on a “swap” at a higher level, had now been withdrawn by the company.

7a) - Prohibition Order at Stanton Moor: JEN explained that officers had recently met the company to discuss the ROMP and the possible exchange of permissions with SMQ and NPQ. She explained that PDNPA now has an estimate of the volumes at SMQ, albeit with some difference of opinion with the company’s advisor, but with some middle ground. JRS explained the relative merits of the appeal (now withdrawn, the ROMP and an exchange application in accordance with the Stanton Moor Principles).

The Chair asked what the timeline is for a decision.

JEN stated that she hopes that at the of November they will have all the additional information from the company, working on a possible swap at the right level. An application for a swap would be dealt with in a few months’ time on this basis.

ADT – a swap would be in accordance with the SM Principles.

JEN – any swap would be with a section 106 agreement which would result in an unopposed revocation of the existing permission at SMQ. JEN explained the process and agreed that the NPA would re-notify of any revised details for the application (originally submitted in 2012 and which would be amended to reflect the lower figures for an exchange).

PM wanted to be assured the PDNPA are not being held to ransom, but he now has enough to explain it to his PC.

IK –they are now running with the ROMP and a swap application, which would be best for the company, the landlord and the public.

JRS suggested that this would not be dealt with before Christmas but before Easter.

HG questioned re-consultation times as they had only had 14 days with ROMP and this was hard to find on the PDNPA web site – the Chair agreed with this. JRS agreed to look at this with JEN and the NPA IT team.

## 8. Birchover Quarry

The following update was reported by RC:

- The tip has largely gone into Barton Hill/Dungeon
- They are working on the conditions on the permission, mostly discharged. Traffic signs and surveys done, lighting scheme being implemented, installed 6 nesting boxes, scheme for return of eastern field to heathland submitted; landscaping and restoration scheme nearly completed. New stile to go on boundary near Corkstone – some discussion about the design of this. HG would prefer a swing gate for better access. RC said condition requires a stile, but JEN said a swing gate is not likely to be a problem for PDNPA
- Section 73 application to cover new building design to be submitted – this will include the whole scheme, but the main change is the building design. AT questioned why this is being done – RC explained that is not ideal as the whole scheme needs to be submitted, but the design has been given more thought since the permission was granted.
- Highways – PM raised the Enthoven traffic problems and asked if Birchover drivers will be local. RC said “vast majority will be local and regular”. PM said use of SatNavs is a problem, but review of restrictions is taking place this week.
- PM raised potential noise on moor. RC said new shed will accommodate existing equipment, nothing new. Noise insulation will be improved in existing shed

**The Chair closed the meeting at 19.20. It was agreed to hold the next meeting in early February 2016.**