



Regulatory Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Colliton Park,
Dorchester, DT1 1XJ on Thursday, 27 October 2016

Present:

David Jones (Chairman)

Pauline Batstone, Beryl Ezzard, Ian Gardner, Mervyn Jeffery, Paul Kimber, David Mannings,
Daryl Turner, Margaret Phipps, Peter Richardson and David Walsh.

Officers Attending:

Maxine Bodell (Economy, Planning and Transport Services Manager), Philip Crowther (Solicitor),
Andrew Helmore (Principal Planning Officer), Huw Williams (Principal Planning Officer) and
David Northover (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

Public Speakers:

Dr Simon Colcutt, Archaeological Consultant - on behalf of Knightsford Group Parish Council
Tony Meader, Knightsford Group Parish Council
Jenny Meader, local resident
Nigel Hill, Crossways local resident
Nick Dunn, Applicant's agent

all attending for minute 70.

(Notes: These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any
decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the
Cabinet to be held on **Thursday, 8 December 2016.**)

Apologies for Absence

66

Apologies for absence were received from Steve Butler, Barrie Cooper, Mike Lovell
and Mark Tewkesbury.

Code of Conduct

67 There were no declarations by members of disclosable pecuniary interests under the
Code of Conduct.

Minutes

68 The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016 were confirmed and signed.

Public Participation

69 Public Speaking

There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing
Order 21(1).

There were no public questions received at the meeting in accordance with Standing
Order 21(2).

Petitions

The consideration of petitions was now the responsibility of the Petitions Panel,
established for that purpose.

**WD/D/15/001058 - for the variation of conditions 4, 11, 15 and 21 of planning
permission 1/E/2005/0742 for revised phasing and restoration to facilitate the extension**

of the quarry, including changes to internal layout and amending the permitted noise monitoring scheme at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester and WD/D/15/001057 - for an extension of the quarry to the north to provide additional silt lagoon capacity and for the erection of an aggregate bagging plant, at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester

70

The Committee considered two reports by the Service Director – Economy which recommended the granting of planning permission in respect of:-

- Application WD/D/15/001058 - which sought a variation of conditions 4, 11, 15 and 21 of planning permission 1/E/2005/0742 for revised phasing and restoration to facilitate the extension of the quarry, including changes to internal layout and amending the permitted noise monitoring scheme at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester, these being:-
 - Condition 4 – to regularise the location of the field conveyor, how the phasing of operations were managed, where stockpiling would be permitted and how screening/noise attenuation bunds would be provided;
 - Condition 11 – to amend the existing noise limit, at Watermead Cottage, from 40db to 48db;
 - Condition 15 – to provide for the importation of aggregates to supply the bagging plant; and
 - Condition 21 – to regularise the way in which the extraction phases were managed.

These variations were needed as the current operations did not accord with the development as approved under the original permission for the site, because operation requirement proved different from those anticipated at the time of the application. Officers were confident that these proposals would satisfactorily meet those needs.

- Application WD/D/15/001057 – which sought an extension of the quarry to the north to provide additional silt lagoon capacity and for the erection of an aggregate bagging plant, at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester.

As these two applications were inextricably linked and each had a bearing on the other, the Committee agreed that they should be considered as one presentation, but that the Committee's decisions and the granting of any permissions should remain separate and discrete.

With the aid of a visual presentation, officers described the proposals and planning issues in detail, what these entailed and what they were designed to achieve. Plans and photographs were used to show the characteristics of the site, its location, access and to describe how the quarrying operations would be progressed. The site's land form and its context within the surrounding landscape were shown, with views from within and around the site. The activities and operations proposed to be undertaken were described in detail by officers, as well as the machinery to be used. Arrangements for the way in which the quarrying was to be phased and managed, its progression and the relationship between each phase were also described. Similarly the restoration process was described and how this would be achieved, with the aim to eventually return the site to agricultural use. Officers explained the water management arrangements and bending proposals by the same means. Officers described the type of activities which were to take place on site; their relationship with the current quarrying operations; the site's setting within the landscape; the local highway and rights of way network; and the topography and geology of the area. Confirmation was provided that the applications would not affect the outputs of material from the quarry nor the working hours for the proposed operations.

Particular emphasis was made of the relationship between the site, neighbouring land and properties; the hamlet of Woodsford and the Grade 1 Listed Woodsford Castle – including several photographs showing views towards Woodsford Castle from the quarry -, and the River Frome.

The report described in detail what issues had been taken into consideration as part of the Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Assessment process and explained that as a result of the impact on the setting of Woodsford Castle, an assessment of alternatives had been considered with the alternative being either inappropriate, impractical or unviable to the way in which the quarry operated.

Officers drew the attention of the Committee to what was contained in the Update Sheet, as appended to these minutes, and the responses made to issues raised in late representations. Whilst these would receive direct responses in due course, officers were confident that all of the issues raised had been satisfactorily addressed either in the Update Sheet, in the report itself or in the conditions which would accompany any grant of permission.

Officers explained the need for the mineral extraction to provide the means for a lagoon to be created which was necessary to meet the additional silt capacity required by future quarrying operations. Officers explained that where the additional lagoons were originally proposed to be sited was now being used for stockpiling of material as the original facility for this had been insufficient. Offices also explained that bunds had not been constructed in the way permitted and that further bunds were proposed.

The proposed bagging plant was intended to replace that which was previously operated out of Warmwell Quarry, but which had now closed. This was to be enclosed to minimise potential nuisance from noise and dust.

Officers confirmed that the reasoning for the proposals was to regulate that which was currently in place so that these were applicable and could reasonably be met.

The consultation process, and responses received to this, was drawn to the attention of the Committee. West Dorset District Council, and its Environmental Health section, had raised no objection to either application, as was the case for Natural England, subject to conditions. Whilst not formally objecting to the application, concern had been expressed by Historic England over the potential detrimental impact the developments would have on Woodsford Castle and over what considerations had been given to any alternative arrangements.

Knightsford Group Parish Council objected to the proposals on grounds of noise, delayed restoration and historic environment, all of which were referred to in detail in the Service Director's report. However officers were confident that any issues raised by statutory consultees had been adequately and satisfactorily addressed by conditions.

However the owners of Woodsford Castle, the Landmark Trust – who were not statutory consultees – had objected to the proposal on the grounds of visual detriment and that the requirement to assess alternative sites had been overlooked. They considered that the development would undoubtedly cause material harm to the setting of this Grade 1 listed building and its viability. They also expressed concern that the consultation process undertaken was inadequate.

The opportunity was provided for those wishing to address the Committee. Dr Simon Collcutt, a heritage consultant acting on behalf of the Parish Council, raised a series of concerns about how he considered cultural heritage would be adversely affected by what was being proposed and the inadequacies of the means by which assessments

had been made, including the lack of advice from the District Council's Conservation Officer. He considered that the application had failed to recognise the effect the development would have on Woodsford Castle in particular and that there had been insufficient weight given to the detrimental effect on that asset. He considered that the application's recognition of cultural heritage to be insufficient and inaccurate and that the County Council had failed to properly consider its duties under legislation and policy to listed buildings. On that basis he considered the applications should be refused.

Tony Meader, Knightsford Parish Councillor, did not object to the bagging plant, size of lagoon or stockpiling in principle, but to the close proximity of the lagoons to Woodsford and the Castle and the potential harm to the setting of this heritage asset and to the lack of assessment of alternatives. He did not consider that the public benefits of the scheme had been made out. He agreed that the noise limit at Watermead Cottage was too low but consider at any increase of the permitted noise level should be limited to 43dB, as 10dB above background noise levels, and not the 48dB proposed.

Jenny Meader considered that the proposed silt lagoon and bagging plant were material changes to the site. She said that the proposed increase in noise level to 48db would still be inadequate in meeting the noise level of the operations and that such as noise increase would be perceived as being excessive. She considered that an increase to 43dB would be a compromise and could be achieved with careful design and use of plant and machinery. To allow 48dB would have a significant adverse effect on noise at Watermead Cottage.

Nigel Hill, resident of Crossways, objected in principle to an escalation of the quarry operations and the disruption this caused residents. He stated that it had taken three attempts for the applicant to get the application right without it containing basic errors.

Nick Dunn, for the applicant, explained the need for the development proposals; the justification for the size of the silt lagoons as silt levels had been underestimated; the need to increase the noise limit at Watermead Cottage as that limit was unachievable and did not comply with the NPPF and its Planning Guidance; offered a rebuttal to the objections to noise; and that a Heritage Impact Assessment and review of alternatives had been undertaken, with their results being supported by officers.

The attention of the Committee was drawn to the views submitted by Andy Canning, County Council member for Linden Lea, who whilst not objecting to the granting of permission, expressed his concern about the effect these applications would have on Woodsford Castle and that greater efforts should have been made to mitigate noise concerns.

On a point of order, having arrived shortly after the start of the meeting, the Solicitor asked Councillor Jeffery to confirm that he considered he had sufficient understanding of the merits of the applications and the officer's presentation to play a full part in the debate and to be able to come to a reasoned decision. Councillor Jeffery confirmed that he did.

The opportunity was then provided for the Committee to ask questions of the officer's presentation and this opportunity was taken.

Clarification was sought regarding how assessments had been made about the increase in level of noise from 40 dB to 48 dB and if such an increase could be determined as being marked or negligible. They also asked how a 43 dB limit, as suggested, might be a viable compromise and could be applied in practice. Officers emphasised the complexities of noise assessments and the variables which existed in this regard. Officers explained that, essentially, the 48dB limit was designed to reflect,

and regulate, the noise level of the operations which currently took place and would not be an increase on what was already occurring. The NPPF stated that, where practicable, noise levels should be limited to 10dB above background levels, but if this was not achievable, noise should be as close as possible to that levels, subject to a maximum of 55dB. Officers went on to say that the applicant had taken steps to actively reduce noise at neighbouring properties, the site had been operating since 2009 with no history of complaints from Watermead Cottage until the application and that a limit of 48dB was considered to be acceptable and reflected current noise level readings.

The Committee asked what consideration had been given to the alternative siting of the lagoons and bagging plant so that they would not be as obtrusive to the heritage assets in the vicinity. Officers confirmed that significant weight had to be given to the harm of the setting of a listed building so that there a presumption against granting permission which required an assessment of alternatives to see whether there was an alternative which would reduce or eliminate harm. An assessment of alternative arrangements had been made but that those alternatives considered were not viable in terms of operational, economic, health and safety and environmental impacts and land ownership constraints. A question was also raised about the risk of flooding from lower fill levels. Officers responded by explaining the water management and restoration proposals.

The Committee considered that whilst the Landmark Trust was not a statutory consultee, there should have been some formal dialogue made direct with them and their views taken into consideration. Of particular concern to some members was the detrimental effect this development could have on Woodsford Castle and its viability as an economic and cultural asset.

It was also understood that whilst there had been an assessment made of the visual perspective of the Castle from the site, little had seemingly been done to assess the impact the development would have from the Castle and its environs. As such, members considered that this assessment was critical to their ability to come to decision on the merits of the applications as it had a direct bearing on them being able to do this. Officers emphasised that whilst Historic England, as the statutory consultee in this regard, had raised concerns over the effects of the proposals on the assets, no formal objection had been made.

Officers acknowledged that the original application had not fully justified how alternative options had been assessed, but that subsequently, an assessment of alternatives had been made which concluded that only the proposals now being submitted for consideration were practicable. Officers confirmed that they were now satisfied that the applicant had provided a satisfactory assessment of alternatives. Members were provided with an assurance that quarrying operations were monitored on a regular basis, with any outstanding issues being required to be addressed.

Given the potential implications for Woodsford Castle of this development, some members sought clarification of the District Council's Conservation Section's position with regard to their assessment of the applications. Officers confirmed that whilst their views had been sought, no response had been forthcoming other than the District Council's consultation response. Member's considered that the Conservation Section should be given another opportunity to respond.

Having had an opportunity to question officers on their presentation and in taking into account the representations made by those addressing the Committee, members considered that at this stage they were unable to come to a decision on either application without having further clarification about the effects of the development on Woodsford Castle. The Committee considered that there was a need for officers to make an assessment from the perspective of the Castle.

On that basis, and being put to the vote, it was agreed that further consideration of the applications should be deferred pending the information they had asked for being made available.

Resolved

That consideration of the applications be deferred pending the information as described in the minute above being made available.

Reason for Decision

To be in apposition to have full and meaningful understanding of all aspects of the applications to be able to come to a reasoned judgement.

WD/D/15/001057 - for an extension of the quarry to the north to provide additional silt lagoon capacity and for the erection of an aggregate bagging plant, at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester

71

6/2016/0306 - to modify Condition 2 of Planning Permission 6/2002/0139 (Sand Extraction) - Extension of Duration of Permission until 30 May 2021 at Hines Pit, Puddletown Road, East Stoke, Wareham.

72 The Committee considered a report by the Service Director - Economy on planning application 6/2016/0306 to modify Condition 2 of Planning Permission 6/2002/0139 (Sand Extraction) - Extension of Duration of Permission until 30 May 2021 at Hines Pit, Puddletown Road, East Stoke, Wareham.

Officers explained that the proposal is to extend the life of the planning consent so that extraction operations could continue for a further 5 years (until 30 May 2021) and restoration would be delayed until 30 September 2021. Approximately 400,000 tonnes of the original 650,000 still remained to be extracted.

With the aid of a visual presentation, officers described the proposals and planning issues in detail, what these entailed and what they were designed to achieve. Plans and photographs were used to show the characteristics of the site, its location and to describe how the quarrying operations would be progressed. The site's land form and its context within the surrounding landscape were shown, with views from within and around the site. The activities and operations proposed to be undertaken were described in detail by officers. Arrangements for the way in which the quarrying was to be phased and managed, its progression and the relationship between each phase were also described. Similarly the restoration process was described and how this would be achieved, with the aim to eventually return the site to agricultural use. Officers described the type of activities which were to take place on site; their relationship with the current quarrying operations; the site's setting within the landscape; the local highway and rights of way network; and the topography and geology of the area. Officers explained the need for the mineral and how it would benefit the construction industry.

The report described in detail what issues had been taken into consideration as part of the Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Assessment process. The consultation process was drawn to the attention of the Committee with no objections being raised by either Purbeck District Council or East Stoke Parish Council, amongst others.

Officers drew the attention of the Committee to what was contained in the Update Sheet, as appended to these minutes, and confirmation of the applicant's title.

The Committee took the opportunity to consider the merits of the application and it was

Resolved

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 8.2 of the Service Director's report.

Reason for Decision

As summarised in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 of the Service Director's report.

Questions from County Councillors

73 No questions were received from members under Standing order 20(2).

Update Sheet

74

Planning application WD/D/15/001058

Variation of conditions 4, 11, 15 and 21 of planning permission 1/E/2005/0742 for revised phasing and restoration to facilitate the extension of the quarry, including changes to internal layout and amending the permitted noise monitoring scheme at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester, Dorset for Hills Quarry Products Ltd.

and

Planning application WD/D/15/001057

Extension of the quarry to the north to provide additional silt lagoon capacity and for the erection of an aggregate bagging plant, at Woodsford Farm, Woodsford, Dorchester, Dorset for Hills Quarry Products Ltd.

Update:

Further representations have been received from Cllr Andy Canning (Local Member), Knightsford Parish Council, the occupants of 'Watermead Cottage' and 'The Bushes' and a planning consultant responding on behalf of the Parish Council. The representations raise the following additional planning considerations –

Impact on Heritage Asset

- (a) The public benefits of the proposal have not been properly weighed against the harm to Woodsford Castle
- (b) The views from Woodsford Castle itself have not been considered
- (c) The cumulative impact of the proposal has not been considered
- (d) That the proposed bunding would be an alien feature in the landscape
- (e) That Woodsford Castle's association with Thomas Hardy has not been considered
- (f) That the required restoration schemes, both temporary and permanent, may ultimately differ from what is expected by officers and so may lead to greater harm to Woodsford Castle
- (g) That delayed restoration North of the conveyor is not part of the application; have Heritage England and the Landmark Trust been consulted on this delay?
- (h) Has DCC sought to remedy the deficiencies identified by Heritage England in the May 2016 Heritage Assessment
- (i) That a temporary development of decades does not render harm to Woodsford Castle insignificant
- (j) Why have officers concluded that land within the application site and between Woodsford Castle and the application site makes no historical contribution to the setting of Woodsford Castle
- (k) That the applicant's heritage consultant has not visited Woodsford Castle

Assessment of alternative locations

- (l) Viability statements should be provided for public scrutiny/comment where the

applicants have dismissed alternative locations on the grounds of viability.

Noise

(m) The recently submitted combined noise assessment shows that the noise limit at Watermead Cottage will now be 49 dB which is higher than the 48 being asked for.

(n) The current planning conditions for the site require that discrete noises (eg bangs, clanks, whines) are managed. This condition provides some level of protection for the village and Woodsford Castle. This condition has been removed from the new list of conditions. There has been no consultation on this change.

Temporary Restoration Timescales

(o) No timescale is proposed for the temporary restoration of the area to the north of the conveyor.

(p) Whilst the existing Condition 21 provides for full and detailed restoration scheme for the site, proposed Condition 6 only provides for a “programme” largely in respect of planting. It is considered that the proposed variation represents a significant dilution to the restoration requirements currently in force.

Policy Compliance

(q) The application and the Officer’s Report fail to establish full compliance with DM&WLP Policy 16, namely the requirement that all Policy 6 requirements should be met, together with the provision of significant planning and environmental gains. The public benefits of the proposal are not outweighed by the various harms caused by the proposal.

Applicant Comment:

In response to the comments listed above the applicant’s agent and Heritage Consultant have made the following representations:

(k) As the applicant’s consultant I can confirm that I visited the site in May 2016 and viewed it from PRoWs.

(l) The viability assessments considered contain commercially sensitive information in terms of the royalty rates, sale prices and market predictions. As a result, they are not available for public scrutiny.

(m) This statement is factually incorrect. The noise assessments and correspondence to date clearly highlight that noise will not exceed 48 dB at Watermead and that the imposition of such a noise limit is in accordance with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance England.

Officer comment:

(a) Documents submitted in support of the application set out the public benefits of the proposal. These are as set in paragraphs 6.49 of the report (Agenda Item 6 – Planning Application No. WD/D/15/001057). Officers have also considered the heritage impacts against the wider public interest as set out in the Report.

(b) Planning Officers viewed Woodsford Castle from a number of vantage points including the application site, existing extraction area and areas immediately surrounding Woodsford Castle. Given the significant amount of screening vegetation between the application site and Woodsford Castle it was considered that attempting to view the site from any first floor windows would not have furthered Officers understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed development on the setting of the Listed Building.

(c) The assessment of the impacts presented within the officer’s report are made on the basis of the setting of Woodsford Castle, a setting that includes the existing quarry operations. Therefore whilst not expressed overtly within the officers report the conclusions reached as to the impact of the Woodsford

Castle include the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed quarry operations. The proposed mineral site AS19 is site that has been put forward for mineral extraction under the County Council's Draft Minerals Sites Plan. It is considered that the proposed mineral site AS19 is not a material consideration in the determination of this application.

(d) The landscape impacts of the proposal are set out in paragraphs 6.11 – 6.20 of application WD/D/15/001057. Officers agree that the proposed bund represents an "alien feature" in so far that it is not a natural feature or a feature you would expect to see in the landscape. Nonetheless officers maintain that the bund will not result in a feature that is unduly intrusive or discordant having regard to its visual impact and landscape setting.

(e) The Thomas Hardy association has relevance in so far as the cultural/historic significance of Woodsford Castle is concerned. The association of Woodsford Castle with Hardy is specifically mentioned in the applicant's Heritage Assessment and therefore it is considered this has been taken into account in considering the significance of the heritage asset.

(f) The application documents include indicative restoration proposals for both the proposed extension area and the existing quarry. These details have been considered sufficient to assess the potential impacts of this element of the proposal. The proposed conditions relating to restoration, landscape and ecology management seek to establish the details of these restoration proposals and how they are subsequently managed. It is considered entirely appropriate for such details to be secured and dealt with the use of planning conditions. Any restoration proposals which are not acceptable will not be approved.

(g) Details of the temporary restoration of the strip of land between the conveyor and the swale system to the north are secured by planning condition 6 of application WD/D/15/001058. It is considered that the temporary restoration proposals form part of the development proposal which has been considered within the officers report. The conclusions reached as to the heritage impacts of the development proposal are set out in paragraph 6.32 of application WD/D/15/001058. It is considered that the visual appearance between the area when temporarily restored will not be significantly different from when fully restored. It was considered that such a minor change did not require additional input from Historic England. The owners of Woodsford Castle were notified of additional information that was submitted in respect of both application. This additional information included details on the temporary restoration of land to the North of the Conveyor.

(h) Historic England state in their letter of July 2016 state that the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment "is surprising in its lack of reference to map regression and archaeological data regarding its wider setting and association with the wider landscape". No further request was made by Historic England for additional information.

(i) The report conveys the fact that the impacts of the enclosing bund, silt lagoons and extraction of sand and gravel are temporary operations. The report does not seek to place a scale of reduction of impact based up the temporary nature of these operations.

(j) The officer's consideration of the heritage impact of the proposals are clearly set out in paragraphs 6.43 - 6.50 of application WD/D/15/001057 and paragraphs 6.27 – 6.32 of application WD/D/15/001058.

(k) The applicant's heritage consultant has confirmed that he visited the land.

(l) Viability in the report is used in a wider meaning than solely financial

viability and that is clear from the Report. Officers are not aware that a financial viability assessment has been undertaken nor is one needed.

(m) A limit of 48 dB is proposed at Watermead Cottage. Noise assessments and supporting information show that a level of 49dB would only occur if extraction within the new lagoon area was undertaken simultaneously with the operation of stone crushing plant. The applicant has confirmed in an email dated 10th October 2016 that crushing and extraction within the lagoon extension area will not occur simultaneously. Therefore a noise limit of 48dB is proposed at Watermead Cottage and considered to be achievable. It is proposed that Condition 2 (Strict Accordance) of both application WD/D/D/15/001057 and WD/D/15/001058 be amended as set out below to ensure that both activities do not occur simultaneously.

(n) Condition 24 of planning application W/D/15/001058 and condition 28 of planning application WD/D/15/001057 both relate to the submission of schemes which specify measures to minimise the emission of any discrete continuous noise or distinct impulses.

(o) The submission of details and timings for the restoration of the area to the north of the conveyor are required as part of condition 6 of both application WD/D/15/001057 and WD/D/15/001058.

(p) Officers consider that the proposed conditions as set out in paragraph 9 of both reports are appropriate and do not represent a dilution of requirements imposed by existing conditions. All measures proposed within the existing restoration condition for the site are carried forward or are covered under the requirements of other proposed conditions.

(q) Reference to the compliance of the applications with policy 6(ii)f of the DM&WLP should have been included in paragraph 6.20 of application WD/D/15/001057 and paragraph 6.13 of application WD/D/15/001058. It is proposed that the last sentence of these paragraphs is amended to read "*The proposal is therefore seen to be in accordance with policy 6(ii)f of the DM&WLP, policy 4 of the BD&PMS and paragraph 109 of the NPPF*". All other relevant requirements of policy 6 of the DM&WLP are considered and referenced within the officers reports. With specific reference to application WD/D/15/001057 the application is considered to meet all the requirements of Policy 16 of the DM&WLP in that all the requirements of policy 6 are met as the proposal is for a limited small scale extension to an existing site (which meets the spirit of all the requirements of Policy 17 of the DM&WLP which is referred to in policy 16 but was not itself saved and is therefore not part of the development plan). Consideration to the public benefit of the proposal weighed against the slight harm to the heritage asset are detailed in paragraph 6.49 of application WD/D/15/001057.

Change to Condition:

Agenda item 5 – Planning Application No. WD/D/15/001058

Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority or unless otherwise required or authorised by these conditions, no development shall be carried out other than in strict accordance with the supporting information Drawing No's 91077/A dated 29 March 2005 , WOOD001 Rev A dated February 2015, WOOD002 Rev B dated October 2015, 14803-2500-00 Rev B dated Sept 2015, 14803-2500-002 dated March 2014, WQ-02500-NF001MT dated 22 Nov 2013, 91077/c0/w/1. Rev B dated Jan 2015, email dated 22 March 2016 16:20 **and email dated 10 October 2016 16:29.** Operations on the application site shall be carried out in accordance with the

approved plans and details and no part of the development specified therein shall be amended or omitted without the prior written approval of the Waste Planning Authority.

Agenda Item 6 – Planning Application No. WD/D/15/001057

Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority or unless otherwise required or authorised by the conditions of this permission, no development shall be carried out other than in strict accordance with the supporting information and Drawing No's WQSLP-5000-002 dated May 2015, WOOD001.RevA dated February 2015, WOOD002.Rev B dated October 2015, 14803-2500-001 Rev B dated Sept 2015, WQ-02500-NF001MT dated 22 Nov 2013, 2619/01 Rev A dated May 2014, 91077/c0/w/1. Rev B dated Jan 2015, email dated 22 March 2016 16:20 **and email dated 10 October 2016 16:29**. Operations on the application site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details and no part of the development specified therein shall be amended or omitted without the prior written approval of the Mineral Planning Authority.

Planning application 6/2016/0306 - to modify Condition 2 of Planning Permission 6/2002/0139 (Sand Extraction) - Extension of Duration of Permission until 30 May 2021 at Hines Pit, Puddletown Road, East Stoke, Wareham.

Update:

In paragraph 1.1 the applicant should be referred to as Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited – Thereafter in the report when it refers to “Hanson” it can be taken that it refers to Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited.

Paragraph 1.4 and 3.3. Both paragraphs refer to an application that “will be” submitted for Hyde pit. This application has now been submitted so should not now be referred to in the future tense.

Officer comment:

These factual corrections were requested by the applicant and are agreed by the planning officer.

Meeting Duration: 10.00 am - 12.30 pm