

Application No: 11/1122M

Location: GAWSWORTH QUARRY, GAWSWORTH, MACCLESFIELD

Proposal: RESTORATION OF GAWSWORTH QUARRY USING INERT  
EXCAVATION AND CONSTRUCTION/DEMOLITION WASTES

Applicant: MR MARTIN O'GARA, O'GARA DEVELOPMENTS

Expiry Date: 12-Jul-2011

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION:**  
**APPROVE subject to conditions and s106 legal agreement**

**MAIN ISSUES:**

Principle of the Development  
Ground Stability  
Sustainable Management of Waste  
Feasibility of High Level Restoration  
Control of Imported Material  
Drainage  
Noise & Air Quality  
Highways and Impacts on Footpaths  
Landscape and Visual Amenity  
Ecology  
Impact on RIGs Designation  
Local Amenity

**BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT**

Members may recall that this application was considered by Strategic Planning Board on 29th February 2012, at which it was resolved that the application should be approved subject to a range of planning conditions and entering into a section 106 agreement to secure:

1. a 10 year extended landscape and nature conservation management scheme;
2. restriction on HGV movements associated with the scheme to an average of 300 movements a day in the event that both Gawsworth and Rough Hey Quarries are worked concurrently;

The planning permission is yet to be issued pending discussions on the section 106 legal agreement. In the intervening period, the National Planning Policy Framework has replaced the previous suite of national planning policy guidance for mineral development upon which Members based their resolution. In addition, the applicant has submitted a modified phasing

plan, a more detailed conservation management plan and proposed slightly amended the hours of operation.

The item has therefore brought back to Strategic Planning Board to provide Members with the opportunity to reconsider their decision in the light of the additional revisions and new mineral planning policy context. A complete and updated report on the application is presented below.

## **DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND CONTEXT**

The site is the former Gawsworth Gritstone Quarry which is located to the east of A523 London Road, approximately 4.5km south of Macclesfield and approximately 1.1km south of the small settlement of Oakgrove.

Gawsworth Quarry and neighbouring Rough Hey Quarry directly to the north, form part of Gawsworth Common which lies in an elevated position on the western slopes of Croker Hill. Access to both sites is taken from a track which rises at sharp incline from its junction with A523 in a north east direction up to the quarry and former processing area, and then continues north east around the edge of the quarry and connects to Rough Hey Quarry approximately 600m north of the site. The track also serves a small number of neighbouring residential properties and a commercial property, the closest of which are approximately 370m from the site.

Gawsworth Quarry consists of the main extraction area, internal access tracks, and the former processing area. The 6.9ha application site is made up of the former quarry extraction zone, stockpiles of quarry overburden and soils, and internal access track. On the north west boundary is a 120m long and 35m high open, exposed quarry face. It is formed of glacial till, exposed rock face and a scree slope which is highly weathered and subject to erosion. The quarry face is actively receding northwards, generating a near vertical slope surface and leading to a loss of adjacent agricultural land. Land beyond the application site on the southeast and northeast boundary has already been subject to low level restoration associated with previous quarrying operations to grassland and linear strips of tree planting.

The site is positioned at approximately 300m in height, some 120m above the level of A523. Despite its elevated and exposed position, the site is screened in part from the majority of nearby sensitive receptors which are located on Croker Hill or from A523 due to the undulating hillside and presence of woodland. Long distance views can be obtained from the nearest sensitive receptors which are also situated at similar elevations, the nearest being Fairyhough House to the east which lies at 330m, Hanging Gate Farm to the north east at 280m and Croker Farm to the north at 270m. Merrihill is situated at 200m and whilst being located on the access road to the site, is screened from views of the site by the undulating hillside and natural vegetation.

Within the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (MBLP) the site is located within countryside beyond the Green Belt and lies in the Area of Special County Value; and within a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. It is also designated as a Site of Regional Importance for Geology.

## **THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

This is an application to restore Gawsworth Quarry through the importation of inert excavation, and construction and demolition waste over an 8 year period with restoration to a low grade pasture/upland heath. A total of 435,000m<sup>3</sup> (830,000 tonnes) of material is proposed to be imported, which includes approximately 7000m<sup>3</sup> of topsoil. A maximum of 250,000 tonnes per annum is proposed to be imported over 8 years, with restoration complete over 7 phases, commencing with the deepest part of the quarry, then the remainder of the site being worked in a north eastern to south western direction.

Waste would be imported using 20 tonne Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), with a maximum of 100 movements per day (50 in and 50 out). Access to the site would be via the existing haul road from the A523. The revised hours of operation would now see restoration activities from 0800 - 1800 hours Monday to Friday; and 0800 – 1300 Saturday as opposed to the hours proposed on the original application which were 0700 - 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0730 – 1400 hours Saturday for restoration activities and 0700 – 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0700 – 1400 hours Saturday for plant maintenance. No restoration works are proposed on Sundays or Bank/Public holidays.

The scheme aims to achieve a final restoration profile which would generate a natural landform relative to its pre-extraction condition. The existing ground levels would be increased by up to 24m, which would be achieved by spreading existing quarry overburden/subsoils, and the importation of fill material, overlain by 850mm subsoils and 150mm topsoils which reflects the previously consented restoration scheme. This would create a natural landform with a restoration profile of 1:7. Final restoration to low grade pasture/upland heath is proposed with the use of Gorse and Broom to reflect existing habitats.

Infill material will be sourced from the applicants own construction projects around Macclesfield; and future construction projects at Manchester Airport. Stockpiles of fill material will be stored on those areas awaiting restoration, and re-seeding would be carried out as soon as practicable following placement of topsoil in order to limit the amount of exposed fill left on site.

The applicant does not anticipate the need to screen or crush material on site other than on an occasional basis. The existing wheelwash and weighbridge would be used for the scheme. The existing internal haul road into the application site will be re-aligned and used for HGVs delivering material. The northern access would be broken up following restoration with the southern access retained in-situ for agricultural purposes. The existing surface water drainage system would be retained, with a small extension to the open drainage channel and settlement ponds proposed.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

Planning permission for the extraction of gritstone at Gawsworth Quarry was granted in 1951, with a later permission granted for Rough Hey Quarry in 1955. The quarries have been operated intermittently since then, until 1998 when a new set of conditions were imposed on both Gawsworth and Rough Hey Quarries as a 'Review of Old Permissions' (ROMP) under Environment Act 1995, which was granted consent on 9<sup>th</sup> April 1998 (Ref. 5/97/0961). The ROMP conditions imposed on both quarries permits the extraction of stone from Gawsworth and Rough Hey until February 2041. Since then operations at Gawsworth Quarry have been scaled back and extraction ceased in 2009 due to a slowdown in market conditions. The

restoration scheme proposed under the ROMP in 1998 approved a low level restoration by spreading existing overburden materials and the importation of 850mm of subsoils and 150mm topsoils. It also included for the retention of the existing quarry high wall.

## **POLICIES**

National Planning Policy Statement

Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management

### **Local Plan Policy**

Cheshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan 1999

Policy 9 Planning Applications

Policy 12 Conditions

Policy 14 Areas of Special County Value

Policy 15 Landscape

Policy 17 Visual Amenity

Policy 22 Nature Conservation – check any allocations designations.

Policy 23 Nature Conservation

Policy 25 Ground Water/Surface Water/Flood Protection

Policy 26 Noise

Policy 27 Noise

Policy 28 Dust

Policy 33 Public Rights of Way

Policy 34 Highways

Policy 37 Hours of Operation

Policy 39 Stability and Support

Policy 41 Restoration

Policy 42 Aftercare

Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004

NE1 Landscape Protection and Enhancement

NE2 Landscape Character

NE3 Conservation of Rural Landscape

NE4 Reclaiming and Improving Land

NE11 Nature Conservation Interests

NE12 Local Nature Reserves

NE15 Creation of Habitats

NE17 Nature Conservation for Major Developments

GC5 Countryside beyond the Green Belt

T6 Highway Improvements and Traffic Management

IMP2 Transport

DC3 Amenity

DC6 Circulation and Access

DC9 Tree Protection

DC13 and DC14 Noise

DC17 Water Resources

DC19 Groundwater Resources

DC20 Watercourses

DC63 Contaminated Land

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 'Code of Practice for the submission of mineral planning applications and general site operations'.

### **Other Material Considerations**

Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011

Waste Management Plan for England

Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy Submission Version 2014

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, 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 the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

In view of the level of consultation already afforded to the plan-making process, together with the degree of consistency with national planning guidance, it is appropriate to attach enhanced weight to the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy - Submission Version in the decision-making process.

At its meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014, the Council resolved to approve the *Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy – Submission Version* for publication and submission to the Secretary of State. It was also resolved that this document be given weight as a material consideration for Development Management purposes with immediate effect.

### **CONSULTATIONS (External to Planning)**

**Highways: (comments on original scheme)** The existing site access off the A523 is of a good standard and provides adequate visibility in both directions. The existing permission limits movements to an average of 300 per day in connection with both Gawsorth and Rough Hey Quarries. The proposed movements are likely to be 100 per day which will be contained within the 300 trip limit and would not comprise additional trips on the road network. As there is no material increase in traffic associated with this operation over and above that already consented, no highways objections are raised. Existing conditions imposed on consent 5/97/0961 are recommended to be replicated on any new consent; in respect of hours of operation, control of vehicular access to the site, control of mud on the highway, sheeting of vehicles, limit on number of vehicle movements to not exceed 300 movements per day, and records of vehicle movements to be retained.

In respect of the potential cumulative impact of implementing both the existing consent at Rough Hey and the proposed scheme, Highways Officer considers that in the event both sites

are worked simultaneously, the vehicle movements over both sites could be adequately controlled to within the 300 trip limit by means of a S106 Legal Agreement.

#### Comments on revisions to the scheme -

There will be no change in the highway considerations raised by these amendments

**Environmental Health:** Potential noise impacts are from mobile site plant (excavator, CAT, roller), fixed plant and delivery vehicles. The noise assessment makes calculations at sensitive receptors for the individual and combined activities and assumes that all of these activities are operating concurrently which can be considered as a worst case assessment. These estimates are then compared with suggested noise limits for all activities based on national planning guidance. The proposals use an assumed background level but it is unclear, from the information provided, from where this level has been derived. However, the level used is consistent with that used in the extant planning permission and can therefore be considered as acceptable and used to calculate the limit values for this proposal. The calculations in the assessment indicate that the limit values should not be exceeded. We would expect that a noise monitoring programme is established to ensure that these limits are complied with as condition of accepting this proposal.

The noise impacts relating to the potential use of a sorting trommel are shown to be significantly dependant on the effectiveness of the mitigation provided, I would expect that the location of any such plant, as well as any details relating sound power levels, details of proposed mitigation and predicted impacts at sensitive receptors to be submitted prior to any such plant operating on the site. This should be extended to include any fixed plant that may be used. We would expect noise limits relating to these types of plant to be set as to not exceed the background level by more than 5dB(A) as per guidelines given in the Cheshire Planning Noise Guidelines Part 1: Mineral Extraction and Waste Disposal and to also reflect guidance given in BS4142.

The noise impacts of vehicles using the site access road have been included in this assessment however they do not assess the impact at the most sensitive of residential receptors, Merrehill which is close to the lower end of the access road near the A523. However, this planning application would result in fewer vehicles movements on the access road than the extant planning permission. The altered proposed operating hours of 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0800 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays are acceptable and should be conditioned along with the required number of vehicle movements. It is accepted that there could be issues in icy conditions with tarmacing steep gradients of the access road. Therefore it should be a condition that both the existing tarmac and hardcore sections of the access road should be maintained to an acceptable standard so as to minimise impact noises from vehicles. The road sections that are currently tarmaced should continue be so throughout this development.

Noise impacts would be controlled further by the use of 'white noise' reverse alarms as outlined in the planning application and I would request that the provision of these for site-based mobile plant to be conditioned.

The potential dust impacts from vehicles and on-site activities are detailed in the application and it sets out a dust management plan and complaints procedure relating to the mitigation of

dust nuisance. This covers most of the potential issues relating to dust emissions. In addition to these measures, the re-seeding of restored levels at the earliest practical opportunity, the management of any earth bunds and consideration of weather conditions should also be covered in the control of dust emissions. A dust management plan should be approved as a condition of this proposal.

Following consideration of the potential for the impacts of the extant planning permission at Rough Hey to be operated alongside this application for restoration of Gawsworth, it is proposed that the noise limits condition for the latter operation match those of the former. This is, in effect, a slight tightening of the originally proposed condition (by 2dB(A)) but it is not expected or intended to place an unreasonable or unworkable burden on the operator.

In summary I would recommend that planning permission to this permission is granted subject to conditions that would cover the points described above relating to noise and dust nuisance.

#### Proposed Dust and Noise Related Conditions

In addition to those designed to cover proposed times and vehicle access:

Following consideration of the potential for the impacts of the extant planning permission at Rough Hey to be operated alongside this application for restoration of Gawsworth, it is proposed that the noise limits condition for the latter operation match those of the former. This is, in effect, a slight tightening of the originally proposed condition (by 2dB(A)) but it is not expected or intended to place an unreasonable or unworkable burden on the operator.

Except for temporary operations the free field Equivalent Continuous Noise Level [LAeq, 1 hr] at any noise sensitive properties shall not exceed 48 dB LAeq 1hr. Measurements shall be made no closer than 3.5 metres from the façade of properties or other reflective surface and shall be corrected for extraneous noise.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

For temporary operations, the free field Equivalent Continuous Noise Level [LAeq, 1 hr] at any noise sensitive properties shall not exceed 70 dB LAeq 1hr. Measurements shall be made no closer than 3.5 metres from the façade of properties or other reflective surface and shall be corrected for extraneous noise.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

Temporary operations shall not exceed a total of eight weeks in any continuous duration 12 month duration. [Five days written notice shall be given to the Mineral Planning Authority in advance of the commencement of a temporary operation.] Temporary operations shall include bund formation and removal, and any other temporary activity that has been approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority in advance of such a temporary activity taking place.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

No development shall take place until a scheme, for monitoring noise levels arising from the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The scheme shall provide for:

- (i) Frequency and location of monitoring
- (i) Details of equipment proposed to be used for monitoring.
- (ii) Monitoring during typical working hours with the main items of plant and machinery in operation;
- (iii) Comparison against noise limits
- (iv) Monitoring results to be forwarded to the Mineral Planning Authority within 14 days of measurement

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

No non-vehicular fixed or mobile plant (including trommels and crushers) shall be used on the site without the prior written approval from the Mineral Planning Authority. Details of the proposed location, predicted noise impacts of the plant on sensitive receptors, and the details and predicted effects of any mitigation measures should be submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority. The details should demonstrate that noise from such plant shall not exceed 45db LAeq 1hr at any noise sensitive receptor.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

No vehicles and/or mobile plant used exclusively on site shall be operated unless they have been fitted with white noise alarms to ensure that, when reversing, they do not emit a warning noise that would have an adverse impact unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Mineral Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

All plant, equipment and vehicles used on site shall be properly silenced and maintained in efficient working order in accordance with the manufacturer's specification.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

The access road surface shall be maintained in a good condition to minimise noise impacts from vehicles. The surface should be of tarmac unless the gradient is such as to make this surface unsafe. All potholes should be repaired at the earliest opportunity.

No development shall take place until a scheme to minimise dust emissions has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of all dust suppression measures and the methods to monitor emissions of dust arising from the development. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme with the approved dust suppression measures being retained and maintained in a fully functional condition for the duration of the development hereby permitted.  
– The dust management plan submitted with the planning application covers most things, but should include earth bunds and re-seeding

Reason: To reduce the impacts of dust disturbance from the site on the local environment

Prior to its installation details of the location, height, design, and luminance have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The details shall ensure the lighting is designed to minimise the potential nuisance of light spillage on adjoining properties and highways. The lighting and shall thereafter be installed and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To minimise the nuisance and disturbances to neighbours (and the surrounding area and in the interests of highway safety)



### Contaminated land:

All the material to be used in the restoration shall be suitable for its intended use both chemically and physically. Chemical analysis of the imported material shall be carried out to demonstrate that the material is not contaminated. This testing shall include leachate testing to ensure that the material will not cause contamination of controlled waters at, around or below the application site.

**Environment Agency:** No objection. Advice is provided in respect of handling waste and protection of water resources.

**Natural England: (comments on original scheme)** This application is within 3km of the Danes Moss SSSI. However, given the nature and scale of this proposal, no objection raised on account of the impact on designated sites. Standing advice is provided in respect of protected species which includes considering the potential for biodiversity enhancements for bats in accordance with PPS9 and Section 40 of the NERC Act.

In terms of soil handling and reclamation, the scheme is considered to be acceptable and the applicant proposes to follow Defra's Construction Code of Practice for sustainable use of soils. The guidance contained in 'Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils' should also be followed. The requirement for 850mm subsoils and 150mm topsoil being laid over fill material as consented, remains appropriate for a rough pasture after use. It is recommended that both pre and post settlement plans should be prepared to ensure contours on restoration plan would be successfully achieved. Natural England wish to be consulted on final restoration details.

### Comments on revisions to the scheme:

From the information provided with this application, it does not appear to fall within the scope of the consultations that Natural England would routinely comment on. The lack of specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated sites, landscapes or species. It is for the local authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national or local policies on biodiversity and landscape and other bodies and individuals may be able to help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of this site in the decision making process, LPAs should seek the views of their own ecologists when determining the environmental impacts of this development.

We would, in any event, expect the LPA to assess and consider the possible impacts resulting from this proposal on the following issues when determining this application:

### *Protected species*

If the LPA is aware of, or representations from other parties highlight the possible presence of a protected or Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species on the site, the authority should request survey information from the applicant before determining the application. The Government has provided advice on BAP and protected species and their consideration in the planning system. Natural England Standing Advice is available on our website to help local planning authorities better understand the impact of this particular development on protected or BAP

species should they be identified as an issue at particular developments. This also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, the authority should undertake further consultation with Natural England.

#### *Local wildlife sites*

If the proposal site could result in an impact on a Local Site, Local Nature Reserve (LNR) or priority habitat the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application, ensuring that it does so in conformity with the wording of paragraph 168 of the National Planning Policy Framework. For further information on Local Sites, your authority should seek views from your ecologist, or the Local Sites designation body in your area.

#### *Biodiversity enhancements*

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the NPPF. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that *'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'*. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that *'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'*.

#### *Local Landscape*

This proposal does not appear to be either located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscape. All proposals however should complement and where possible enhance local distinctiveness and be guided by your Authority's landscape character assessment where available, and the policies protecting landscape character in your local plan or development framework.

**Cheshire RIGS: (comments on original scheme)** Initial objection lodged due to the loss of geological features of the site. Further discussions have reached agreement that a section of upper quarry face in the north west would be left exposed, and that the bottom of the face should be cleared to expose the base of the rock face in order to retain the important exposures of the Middle Churnet Shale Formation. This would leave a section that would still be suitable for use by educational groups and would still be suitable for its RIGS designation.

No comments received on revisions to the scheme.

**Cheshire Wildlife Trust: (comments on original scheme)** In view of the potential for much of the area to be classified as a UK BAP priority habitat, request provision of the full Target Notes that are referred to but not included in the Environmental Assessment. Would have also expected the site to be assessed with this classification in mind, with ecologists conclusions included in the report. Request full species list arising from the invertebrate survey to be provided, in view of the importance of previously-developed land for insects. Overall consider the recommendations made by the ecologists for restoration of the landfill do not reflect the potential of the restored site for natural succession on low-nutrient substrates.

#### Comments on revisions to the scheme

Gawsworth Quarry is part of and lies wholly within the external boundaries of Gawsworth Common, Whitemoor Hill and Ratcliffe Wood Grade B SBI (Site Code 355), although the central, fenced area of improved grazing land lying immediately northeast of the quarry is excluded from the SBI. Parts of the SBI are on the Cheshire Heathland, Woodland and Peatland Inventories. Qualifying habitats include broad-leaved semi-natural woodland, rock and waste, heathland, grassland and tall herb and bracken. The exposed southeast facing slopes adjacent to the SE boundary of the application site are a mosaic of heathland, gorse/broom scrub, bracken and scattered birch woodland.

Recent planting of hawthorn and oak on slopes at the entrance to the SW end of the quarry has performed very poorly and variably in wet and exposed conditions. Conversely, areas of naturally regenerated birch and hawthorn scrub and heathland have become successfully established on older parts of the SBI. We noted during our site visit that an area of invasive non-native Japanese knotweed *Fallopia japonica* (listed in Part 1, Section 14 of the WCA 1981) has become established in the SBI and on land within the applicant's control northeast of the application site, adjacent to a public footpath.

The submitted Conservation Management Plan gives details of the proposed restoration of the filled quarry. It has been agreed in principle by all parties that the most beneficial and appropriate habitat type that could be established at the site post final landform would be lowland heath. As part of the management plan some control of dominant species may be required this can be achieved by allowing some grazing, therefore it is envisaged that some stock proofing and management will be required. The Cheshire Wildlife Trust has expressed their interest in becoming a tenant.

As part of this management plan, ecological pre-commencement surveys will be required to ensure compliance with specific statutory legislation relating to breeding birds. National Vegetation Community (NVC) surveys will also be conducted at intervals during the restoration programme to assess whether establishment techniques have succeeded. As heathland is slow to establish and requires specific management, an extended period of aftercare of 10 years, after the final phase of infilling is complete is proposed'

CWT has no objection to the backfilling of the quarry with inert excavation and construction/demolition waste. We fully endorse the concept and proposed execution of the restoration plan, and the proposals for survey, monitoring and assessment during operation and post-completion.

Recommendations are made in respect of submission of method statement for controlling Japanese Knotweed and the landowners responsibilities in respect of taking action to prevent this spreading further within the SBI are highlighted.

**Landscape Officer: (comments on original scheme)** no objections subject to conditions requiring the submission of a landscape scheme and implementation programme.

#### Comments on revisions to the scheme

The Conservation management plan examines the aims of the Conservation Management Plan, the local habitats, the proposed establishment techniques and the proposed monitoring that will take place.

We are satisfied that the proposals will result in a restoration scheme that is characteristic of the local landscape and one that will not appear incongruous in the longer term. We do not feel that the proposed restoration will result in any significant or detrimental landscape or visual impacts.

**Ecology officer: (comments on original scheme)** Following submission of the additional ecological surveys, consider that there are no reasonable likely adverse impacts upon protected species or the SBI. The restoration proposals lack specific details on ecological objectives of the proposed restoration. The intention at Gawsworth Quarry would be to create grassland habitats that would be of sufficient quality to contribute to local BAP targets for habitat creation. Grassland habitats only retain their interest if they are subject to some form of management which usually takes the form of grazing or cutting. In the absence of intervention grassland habitats have a tendency to become rank and will eventually develop into woodland habitats of lower nature conservation value. To ensure that any habitats created maintain their ecological interest in the long term, it is recommended that more detailed restoration and aftercare management proposals are secured, along with long term management either a condition or s106 legal agreement.

#### Comments on revisions to the scheme

We are satisfied with the restoration and management proposals as submitted. This is however likely to be a long term project and so it is essential that the council stays in touch with what is happening at the site once restoration and aftercare commences. We suggest conditions that secure all of the following be attached should consent be granted:

- The results of soil tests undertaken on all material intended to form the final seed bed for restoration to be submitted and agreed with the LPA prior to the restoration of each phase.
- National Vegetation Surveys and common standard surveys to be undertaken the year following the seeding of each phase. The results of these surveys to be submitted to the LPA. Any changes to the agreed restoration identified as a result of these surveys also to be agreed in writing with the LPA.
- Biennial National Vegetation surveys and common standard surveys to be undertaken of the entire restored site for the duration of the management period. Any changes to the agreed restoration identified as a result of these surveys to be agreed in writing with the LPA.

**Forestry Officer:** No comments

**Heritage (Archaeology and Conservation): (comments on original scheme)** No archaeological features of significance likely to be affected by the proposals. Earlier features will have been removed by the extraction process. Conservation Officer has no comments.

**Public Rights of Way: (comments on original scheme)** The property is adjacent to public footpath Gawsworth No. 34 as recorded on the Definitive Map. It appears unlikely, however, that the proposal would affect the public right of way. PROW would expect advice note attached to

any permission to ensure applicant is aware of their obligations in respect of works near or affecting public rights of way.

**Health and Safety Executive: (comments on original scheme)** The supporting information, including the bank stability assessment appears to cover most of the information and analysis HSE would expect to be in place. No specific detail is provided in relation to the specific design & construction of the backfill; however HSE would seek such information as part of the overall compliance required for Regulation 31 in Health & safety at quarries, Approved Code of Practice ref L118. In essence this would be rules coming out of the assessment & design which should be in place prior to commencement of the works and contain information on matters such as the overall final profiles; how this is to be achieved in terms of layer thicknesses & compaction; the types of equipment used and the necessary inspection and supervision etc.

**Manchester Airport:** No objection raised to original scheme.

Comments on revisions to the scheme - Although the document could have benefited from some more site specific detail, it contains nothing that raises any concerns for us and we are therefore perfectly content to endorse the proposals as they stand. As per our original safeguarding response, we are very happy with this restoration scheme and would like to see much more of this approach to quarry restorations as it creates a high value wildlife habitat with no measurable consequences in terms of birdstrike risk because the species that prefer heathland are of low risk due to their size and/ or behaviour.

**Ramblers Association: (comments on original scheme)** Concern is raised over the potential effects of the scheme on Gawsworth Footpath 34 which lies within 50 metres of the site. It is not clear what proportion of the vehicle movements to achieve phases 1, 3 & 4 in the north eastern section of the site might require use of the section of the track shared by the footpath, which is outside the site boundary but within the owners land boundary. The main concern is to ensure that the footpath continues to be available and unobstructed during the development. In terms of nuisance and dust impacts, it seems likely that parts of the footpath (i.e. those within 50-100m of the site during phases 3 & 4) would be in an area where the 'magnitude of the impact' was 'moderate' - albeit the exposure would only be temporary. The effects might be mitigated by the proposed control measures although these will be monitored by receptors more distant from the site.

## **VIEWS OF THE PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL**

Comments on original scheme: Gawsworth Parish Council – recommend refusal on the basis of impacts on the local environment, particularly upheaval and disruption.

No comments made on revisions to the scheme.

## **OTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

Comments on original scheme: 8 letters of objection were received from local residents. The principal matters of concern relate to nature of infill material and potential to cause contamination; length of time taken to restore the site and capability of restoration; ecological concerns and potential opportunities for wildlife enhancement; hours of operation; highway safety and vehicular access; noise and disturbance; landscape and visual impacts; air and water pollution; land stability issues.

Comments on revisions to the scheme: The landowner's representative has objected to the scheme on the basis of the sterilisation of gritstone resulting from the scheme. A further letter has been received from a local resident raising concerns over detrimental noise impacts in the early morning, especially arising from empty heavy good vehicles traversing poor road surfaces.

## **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

### **Principle of Development**

The existing historical consent for quarrying (5/97/0961) permits a final restoration to pasture; which would be achieved by spreading the existing overburden, and importing sufficient material to layer 850mm subsoils and 150mm topsoils across the site. As such, the principle of restoring the site using imported fill material, and a final restoration to pasture has previously been consented. These elements are retained within the proposed scheme; however the key difference is the level of fill material proposed to complete the restoration which is higher than originally permitted.

The applicant justifies a high level restoration proposed on the basis that the approved scheme would not have sufficient material to stabilise the quarry face which is receding onto third party land and presents a health and safety risk. As a secondary benefit, the applicant maintains this restoration scheme provides a sustainable outlet for managing construction, demolition and excavation (CD&E) waste; in order to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and divert it from landfill. These matters are considered further below.

### **Sustainable Management of Waste**

The scheme would enable Construction, Demolition and Excavation (C,D&E) waste to be recovered and re-used as part of the quarry restoration. This material makes up the largest waste stream in Cheshire; comprising 49% of the overall waste arisings; and this is expected to increase to approximately 1.5m tonnes by 2020. A large proportion of CD&E waste is currently sent to landfill, and The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 recently introduced, set a target to recover at least 70% of CD&E waste by 2020.

PPS10 and CRWLP both seek to deliver the waste hierarchy with the onus on re-use, recycling and recovery before disposal. In view of the rising costs of landfill, and the need to look for alternative sustainable ways to transport and manage waste; this scheme provides an outlet for inert excavation and construction/demolition waste arisings for construction projects in the north of the authority and from adjacent authorities. There are few similar facilities of this scale in this part of the authority that are able to accept CD&E waste and thus the scheme enables large quantities of CD&E waste to be diverted from landfill. As such this is considered to accord with the overall approach of CRWLP, and PPS10.

### **Feasibility of High Level Restoration**

Concern from local residents relates to the proposed level of restoration, timescale proposed and ability to complete the scheme. The existing quarry void created varies in depth from approximately 280m AOD to 313m AOD. In order to achieve a natural restoration profile relative to the adjacent landform, the scheme would increase ground levels across the site by up to 24m (approximately) through the layering of soil making material, subsoils and topsoils. A total of 830,000 tonnes is proposed to complete the restoration proposals, with 250,000

tonnes of fill material imported per annum over 8 years. The fill material would be sourced from the applicants own construction projects and major infrastructure projects in the north of the authority and adjacent authorities including developments at Manchester Airport.

The 8 year timeframe is considered reasonable given the scale of the restoration activities proposed; and builds in an allowance for potential downturns in the availability of fill material from construction projects. The revised phasing sequence would result in the site being restored progressively, commencing with the main quarry floor to stabilise the back quarry wall, with work then progressing in a southern direction. Planning conditions could be imposed to ensure that re-seeding is undertaken following completion of each phase so as to limit visual impact. Conditions could also be imposed to ensure that, in the event of any cessation of infilling prior to completion of the development, a revised restoration scheme can be secured. As such this is considered to accord with policies 15 and 17 of CRMLP, policy DC1 of MBLP and the approach of NPPF.

### **Mineral sterilisation**

Objections have been raised regarding the sterilisation of gritstone which would result from the restoration of the site. There is no data presented within the application to ascertain with any certainty what quantity of mineral reserve remains on the site following historical quarrying, although it is accepted that the scheme will result in some sterilisation of gritstone. It is however noted that the site forms one part of a wider area which has permission for mineral extraction, and the area being sterilised has been worked for a number of years and the resultant landform has created an unstable ground conditions on the site.

In response to this point, the applicant notes that no evidence has been presented by objectors to identify the quantity of mineral that would be sterilised, or the economic viability of quarrying this remaining resource. They also note that the land has been quarried to the boundaries of the lease and is now unstable for any further quarrying; and to continue quarrying would be uneconomical.

NPPF states that great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction and local authorities should make provision for the maintenance of at least 10 years landbank for crushed rock. The corresponding requirement at a sub-regional level for Cheshire East is maintenance of a 7 year landbank (Policy 53 of Minerals Local Plan).

The latest annual monitoring report produced by the North West Aggregate Working Party Annual Report 2013 identifies that the sales of aggregate crushed rock are low with reserves remaining at 4.29 million tonnes for the sub-region of Cheshire. As such the aggregate crushed rock landbank is 107.25 years which remains far in excess of the 10 year minimum requirement set out in the NPPF.

Whilst the scheme would result in the sterilisation of a portion of gritstone, based on the current estimated landbank, recent demand for crushed rock and the environmental benefits arising from the scheme in terms of achieving the satisfactory restoration of the site and addressing land stabilisation issues, it is considered that these benefits outweigh the loss of mineral resource on this part of the site in this instance. On this basis the scheme is not considered to conflict with Policy 53 of CRMLP and paragraph 144 of NPPF.

### **Ground Stability**

The exposed 36m high quarry face is currently eroding onto third party land; which is visually apparent as a fenceline now hangs suspended in mid-air, where the quarry wall once was. The applicant maintains that the consented low level restoration would result in an unstable wall rim which would progressively erode and which would leave sections of the site inaccessible in the long term due to health and safety risks.

The stability of both the restoration scheme and adjacent quarry land has been raised as a concern by local residents. The Bank Stability Assessment submitted considers both the stability of the existing quarry wall, and that of the final restoration profile. It identifies that the existing scree slope is at the point at which the material has reached the limit of its stability. The glacial till stands vertically and is over-steepened whilst the shaly mudstone is highly susceptible to weathering. All elements of the slope are noted to be at the limit of their stability. The assessment concludes that without stabilisation, the slope will continue to unravel and deeper seated failures could occur. In regards to the stability of the proposed scheme, the assessment identifies that, at a final restoration profile of 1:7, this would be satisfactory in securing the stability of the site.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) confirm that the Bank Stability Assessment contains all necessary information. The engineering details of the scheme in terms of its design and construction, and the compaction of the fill material and layer thicknesses would be addressed by HSE under separate controls as the Quarries Regulator. Equally issues associated with creation of unstable zones in the fill material associated with impeded flow of groundwater due the proposed compaction and soil layering techniques are addressed in the Waste Recovery Plan submitted to Environment Agency (EA) to accompany the Environmental Permit. This accords with policies 9 and 39 of CRMLP, policy 12 of CRWLP, and the approach of the NPPF.

### **Control of Imported Material**

Concern has been raised over the nature of fill material proposed and the potential for contaminants to harm human health or groundwater. Inert soil making materials, subsoils and topsoils are proposed to restore the site and the works would require an Environmental Permit regulated by the Environment Agency.

PPS10 makes it very clear that planning authorities should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. The Environmental Permitting regulations include adequate measures to control the type of waste and any associated pollution impacts. This includes procedures regarding the receipt and acceptance of waste, recording and monitoring movements of waste, and inspection/testing requirements. It also assesses the appropriateness of the soil making material, the physical or chemical properties, and whether this could adversely affect groundwater or human health.

It is noted that neither the Environment Agency nor the Environmental Health Officer raise any objection to the scheme and planning conditions are recommended to ensure all restoration material is chemically analysed to demonstrate that the material is not contaminated, which could include leachate testing to ensure that the material will not cause contamination of controlled waters at, around or below the application site. The scheme is therefore considered to accord with policy 18 of CRWLP, policies 9 and 25 of CRMLP, policies DC63, DC19, and DC20 of MBLP and the approach of PPS10 and NPPF.



## **Drainage**

An aquifer lies to the south and east of the site which supports a very small number of extractions for individual domestic and farm use. The nature of fill material is not anticipated to have any potential adverse impact on the quality of ground and surface water. The Environmental Assessment identifies that the scheme may lead to a slight increase in percolation into the ground rather than drainage to surface water, but this is not anticipated to have a significant impact on ground or surface water features in the area. The quarry currently discharges to surface water at Bosley Brook via a series of existing ditches and silt catchment sumps. An extension to one of the existing open drainage channels is proposed to incorporate additional silt catchment sumps which will ensure water is controlled during rainfall to prevent flooding. Full details of the drainage scheme proposed can be required by planning condition and approved in conjunction with Environment Agency. This accords with policies 18 of CRWLP, policies 9 and 25 of CRMLP policies DC17, and DC20 of MBLP; and NPPF.

## **Noise and air quality**

Concerns raised relate to potential noise and dust impacts arising from the scheme, particularly associated with the use of the haul road. The main source of noise generation from the scheme is anticipated to be from mobile/fixed plant, and delivery of vehicles. The noise assessment demonstrates that the noise levels generated by the scheme will remain within levels set in MPS2 and will be consistent with those previously consented on the site for quarrying operations. The cumulative noise impacts of both Gawsorth and Rough Hey Quarries operating concurrently have been assessed, and planning conditions can be imposed which would limit noise levels to 48 dB(A) LAeq on the application site. This would provide consistency with consented noise levels at Rough Hey, and provide mitigation to any sensitive receptors. There may be a need for occasional use of plant to screen or crush material on site to screen out larger particles or for soil blending. The details of such equipment, including its location, predicted noise impacts and details of any mitigation can be secured by planning condition prior to its use to ensure noise levels do not exceed the background level by more than 5dB(A) in accordance with relevant guidelines. A number of conditions are recommended to control noise levels from temporary works, submission of noise monitoring scheme, and silencing of vehicles to ensure there is no adverse impact on residential amenity associated with noise impacts.

Concern has been raised by local residents over the potential noise generated by HGVs traversing the 1100m access track to and from the A523. The track is tarmaced for an initial 150m, beyond which is hardcore which is in poor condition with pot holes. The potential to tarmac the full length of track to the processing area has been discounted on safety grounds as the track is on a steep incline for most of its length, which could be hazardous in wintery conditions if tarmaced. An agreement has been reached with the applicant to repair the access track prior to use and maintain this for the duration of the works, which can be secured by planning condition.

Impacts in terms of dust can be controlled by means of a dust management plan required by condition. This will include the proposals for re-seeding, management of earth bunds and implementation of mitigation for dust encountered on site or the public highway. As such the scheme is considered to accord with policies 26, 27 and 28 of CRMLP, DC3, DC13 of MBLP, and the approach of the NPPF

### **Highways and Impacts on Footpaths**

Concerns have been raised over the impact of the scheme on the safety and operation of the local highway network, along with the suitability of the haul road to accommodate two passing HGVs. Access to the site is taken from A523 via the existing consented haul road which previously served the quarrying activities. The Highway Officer considers that the existing access is of a good standard with adequate visibility and is sufficiently wide to accommodate two HGVs.

The existing consent allows for an average of 300 heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements per day (150 in and out) when measured over a year; with movements not to exceed 540 (270 in and out) in any single day. The existing consent permits mineral operations until 2040. Proposed vehicle movements would remain well within this level at a maximum of 100 movements a day (50 in and out). Where necessary, and as an exception to normal workings, the applicant is seeking an allowance for increasing vehicle numbers for a temporary short period on occasions where this is required to meet a particular contract e.g. where large quantities of infill material are generated by a major construction project. It is proposed that this would be a temporary specified period only and could be controlled by suitable planning condition to ensure any increase still remains within the allowance of the existing consent.

The restrictions on consented vehicle movements apply to both Gawsworth and adjacent Rough Hey Quarry, both of which are served by the same haul road to A523. It is necessary to control vehicle movements from both quarries by means of a S106 agreement to ensure that, in the event quarrying at Rough Hey Quarry re-commences, any cumulative level of HGVs associated with both sites would remain within the existing 300 consented. The Highways Officer considers that as the overall number of vehicle movements would be contained within the 300 trips limit, there would be no additional trips on the road network. As such no material increase in traffic is anticipated over and above consented levels. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable subject to planning conditions as specified above and restricting the hours of operation as per the existing consent.

Concern has been raised regarding potential conflict between users of footpath No.34 and the existing haul road in the north east of the site. The access into the infill area is situated to the south of the footpath so there would be no conflict with users of the footpath. There are existing signs in place on site to warn drivers of the risk of pedestrians, and suitable planning conditions can be imposed to ensure HGVs are restricted to use of the haul road south of the footpath.

The scheme is considered to accord with policies 33 and 34 of CRMLP, policies T1, T3, and T6 of MBLP, and NPPF.

### **Landscape and Visual Amenity**

The visual impact of the scheme and the ability of the restoration proposals to integrate into the landscape have been raised as a concern. The site is partly screened from the majority of nearby sensitive receptors on Croker Hill and A523 due to the undulating hillside on which it sits and surrounding woodland. However the exposed quarry face creates a void in the landscape which offers a detrimental visual impact to those properties with views of the site.

Whilst the restoration scheme would raise the ground levels significantly from that consented previously; the final scheme would improve the overall visual impact of the site and create a natural end profile. The site has few visual receptors and any visual impacts associated with restoration operations prior to completion are not anticipated to differ in scale or nature of impact from those presented during previous consented quarrying activities. The revised phasing scheme proposed would also ensure that early restoration is achieved which would bring benefits in terms of visual impacts.

The proposed restoration to pasture/upland heath can be achieved with relatively poor quality topsoils. The dominant habitat type in this location is upland heath, with gorse, broom, bracken and bramble. The restoration scheme will enhance this habitat with 20m wide strips of gorse and broom planted along the edge of the existing habitat and a further 30m strip left to regenerate naturally with grass and gorse, which is intended to soften the 'hard edges' of the quarry. The remaining areas will be re-seeded with a grass seed mix. The Landscape Officer considers that the principles outlined in the in the conservation management plan will result in a restoration scheme that is characteristic of the local landscape and the resultant landscape created will not appear incongruous in the longer term or have any adverse impact on the ASCV designation. As such the scheme is considered to accord with policies 15 and 17 of CRMLP, Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE11, DC8, and DC9 of MBLP, and NPPF.

## **Ecology**

The site forms part of Gawsworth Common, Whitemoor Hill and Ratcliffe Wood Grade B Site of Biological Importance (SBI). The Environmental Assessment identifies that there will be no reasonable likely adverse impacts upon protected species or the SBI. The site at present offers limited ecological value. Cheshire Wildlife Trust initially raised objections to the original scheme over the scope of the environmental assessment which they did not consider sufficient and felt that the restoration proposals did not reflect the ecological potential of the site. However in their comments on the revised scheme, in particular reference to the conservation management plan they endorse the concept and proposed execution of the restoration plan, and the proposals for survey, monitoring and assessment during operation and post-completion.

The Nature Conservation Officer is satisfied that there are no reasonable likely adverse impacts upon protected species or the SBI. The proposed restoration plan details a mosaic of acid grassland and heathland which is considered appropriate in the context of the surrounding habitats and would contribute to BAP targets for habitat creation. The Nature Conservation Officer is satisfied with the overall restoration and management proposals, subject to planning conditions being secured in respect of:

- Submission of soil tests on all material used to form the final seed bed for the restored site;
- National Vegetation Surveys and common standard surveys to be undertaken the year following the seeding of each phase;
- Biennial National Vegetation surveys and common standard surveys to be undertaken of the entire restored site for the duration of the management period.

Grassland habitats require a suitable grazing regime to prevent them from developing into woodland habitats of lower nature conservation value. The conservation management plan submitted provides more detailed information on the habitats to be created upon completion

of the restoration of the site; along with the general principles for long term management, establishment techniques and monitoring to be adopted to ensure the lowland heath habitats become established.

To ensure that the habitats created maintain their ecological interest in the long term, the Council Ecologist recommends that the management arrangements detailed in the conservation management plan be secured by means of a s106 legal agreement for a 10 year period following completion of each phase of the site's restoration. This reflects the approach of the original scheme and accords with the provisions of the CIL Regulations.

As such the scheme, subject to securing planning conditions and a s106 legal agreement for the matters raised above, the scheme is considered to comply with NPPF, policies 12, 13, 22, 23 and 41 of CRMLP, and policies NE3, NE11, NE13 and NE15 of MBLP.

### **Impact on RIGs Designation**

The site is subject to a RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Site) designation, being an important Namurian site, and having exposures of the Middle Churnet Shale Formation. Cheshire RIGs initially objected to the scheme due to the loss of geological interest of the quarry resulting from the restoration of the site. The applicant acknowledged that, in its unstable condition, the quarry face is not suitable for use by Cheshire RIGs as educational visits. An area of stable quarry wall is located directly to the south of the application site which contains sufficient exposures of the strata. This area has previously been retained as this part of the quarry was restored, and is under the control of the applicant, who has agreed to retain this in-situ and remove material from the quarry wall base. This is considered acceptable to Cheshire RIGs and can be secured by planning condition. As such the scheme is considered to accord with CRMLP and NPPF.

### **Local Amenity**

Concern has been expressed by local residents regarding the impacts of the scheme on local amenity, including potential for disruption. The proposed revised hours of operation are slightly shorter than previously proposed and are broadly consistent with consented quarrying operations for the site. This is envisaged to provide additional mitigation to the amenity of closest residential properties. Other planning conditions as outlined in this report will provide further protection of local amenity. The implementation of a local liaison committee can also be secured by means of planning committee to enable local amenity issues to be discussed and addressed by the operator. The scheme is therefore considered to accord with policies 26, 27 and 28 of CRMLP, DC3, DC13 of MBLP, and the approach of the NPPF.

### **Other matters**

In the period after the application was considered by Strategic Planning Board, the landowner's representative identified a technical error made by the applicant on the application form with regards to the applicants details and consequently the associated certificates. In order to address this, the applicant rectified the error, and this amendment, along with the revisions to the scheme identified above was subject to a further round of consultation.

The landowner's representative has noted that the applicant has a mineral lease for mineral extraction and exploitation which expires in 2017; and which allows the applicant to terminate

the lease at any point subject to providing 3 months notice. They state that the landowner retains all rights over the land and have also indicated that the landowner is unlikely to be willing to enter into any s106 legal agreement associated with this application.

With regards to this point, the planning authority should be concerned with whether the development is an acceptable use of the land. The case was previously approved by Strategic Planning Board subject to the provision of a s106 legal agreement for long term management of the site for Nature Conservation and control of vehicle movements which was deemed both reasonable and necessary to make the development acceptable and in this respect complied with the CIL Regulations. This remains the case with the latest revisions to the scheme.

Under the planning legislation any individual can apply for planning permission without requiring ownership of the land in question; and the willingness of interested parties to enter into a legal agreement is a civil matter to be addressed by those parties concerned, and is not material to the consideration of this application. With regards to the specific clauses on the mineral lease, the s106 agreement would tie all interested parties including the landowner and leaseholder into the requirements of the legal agreement, and there would be mechanisms established within that legal agreement to ensure its obligations are complied with in all eventualities.

The landowners representative also notes previous legal proceedings over use of the land for unauthorised activities by the applicant. These points are not material to the consideration of this application.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR THE DECISION**

The scheme presents a sustainable means of diverting construction, demolition and excavation waste away from landfill and enables an unstable quarry to be restored and have a viable end use. The site has consent for quarrying and the impacts associated with this scheme largely reflect in scale and nature those previously consented.

Impacts associated with highways, amenity issues, contamination, visual impacts and environmental health can be adequately controlled by means of planning conditions. Suitable controls are also in place under other environmental legislation to control the processes and pollution control aspects of the scheme.

It is considered that all potential environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated and the scheme offers an overall benefit in terms of landscape and ecological enhancement. Subject to securing the range of planning conditions set out and a s106 legal agreement for long term management of the site for nature conservation interests and control of vehicle movements, the scheme is considered to accord with the policies of the development plan, as well as PPS10 and NPPF.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**APPROVE** subject to entering into a Section 106 agreement to secure:

- 1. a 10 year extended landscape and nature conservation management scheme;**

**2. restriction on HGV movements associated with the scheme to an average of 300 movements a day in the event that both Gawsorth and Rough Hey Quarries are worked concurrently;**

**and subject to the following conditions:-**

- 1. Duration and sequence of working**
- 2. Phased restoration**
- 3. Hours of operation**
- 4. Control over type of material imported**
- 5. Highway vehicle movements**
- 6. Control over noise and dust**
- 7. Plant and machinery**
- 8. Pollution control**
- 9. Drainage scheme**
- 10. Protection of footpath**
- 11. Protection of trees**
- 12. Soil storage and handling**
- 13. Site maintenance and maintenance of access road**
- 14. Details of lighting**
- 15. Submission of detailed landscape and nature conservation management plan**
- 16. Establishment of a liaison committee**
- 17. Control of invasive species**
- 18. Submission of soil tests**
- 19. National vegetation surveys and common standards surveys at each phase of development**
- 20. Biennial national vegetation surveys and common standard surveys for duration of management period.**





© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.  
Cheshire East Council 100049045 2011.  
Cheshire West and Chester Council 100049096 2011.

