



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP308383-20.

Development	Continuation of use of existing concrete batching plant.
Location	Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford.
Planning Authority	Wexford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	20200846.
Applicant(s)	Roadstone Limited.
Type of Application	Retention Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant with Conditions
Type of Appeal	First v Condition 7 and 8
Appellant(s)	Roadstone Limited.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	2 nd April 2021.
Inspector	Hugh Mannion.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site has a stated area of 1.1ha and comprises part of an operating quarry which generally runs south to north along the eastern side the N11 south of Enniscorthy, County Wexford. West of the N11 is the Slaney River. The western element of the application site is flat and comprises a largely vacant block yard associated with an established quarry use on the overall site of which the application site forms part. The site rises towards the east and there is vehicular access over the open block yard turning up onto higher ground along the northern boundary. The concrete batching plant, including mixer house (12.2m high) two associated silos (16.5m high) 4 aggregate storage bins (12.49m high) and ancillary infrastructure are located on both ground levels in this northern end of the site.
- 1.2. To the south and west of the application site is the quarry entrance from the N11, a wheel wash, car park, weighbridge/offices/reception building all at Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. (a) Retention permission for continued use of an existing concrete batching plant, including mixer house (12.2m high) two associated silos (16.5m high) 4 aggregate storage bins (12.49m high) and ancillary infrastructure as authorised under permission PL26.245934 (PA reg reference 20150497).
- 2.2. (b) permission for the erection of one new silo (16.5m high) and 1 aggregate bin (12.49m high), along with improved on site drainage by the installation of a new settlement tank (537m³) and associated ancillary works on an area of about 1.1ha within the Brownswood, Old Quarry Area, Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford.
- 2.3. The application was accompanied by an NIS.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. **Decision-** grant permission subject to conditions. The appealed conditions are:

Condition 7

Total Suspended Particles arising from the on-site operations when measured at any point along the site boundary (boundary with the land not owned or under the applicant's control) shall not exceed 150ug/m³ over a 24-hour averaging time period. Stockpiles of materials relating to the development shall be suitably enclosed and/or relocated in accordance with the detailed proposals for such to be agreed by the planning authority if this TSP emission limit is being breached as a result of open air stockpiles.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.

Condition 8.

Noise, dust and suspended particles generated by the development site shall be monitored in accordance with a detailed scheme for such which has been submitted for the agreement of the planning authority within 2 months of the final date of decision (unless as otherwise agreed with the planning authority).

Monitoring shall be carried out by suitably qualified persons. Dust is to be monitored utilising continuous monitoring equipment with 15-minute averaging internals, which are capable of continuously indicating the concentration of Total Suspended Particulates and PM10.

The planning authority reserve the right to seek/accept changes in the monitoring regime in the light of the results received and any changes in operations at the site.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and proper planning and sustainable development.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. The planner's report recommended a grant of permission subject to 14 conditions.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

3.3. The **Environment Section** recommended a grant of permission subject to conditions limiting noise and dust impacts.

3.4. **Roads Department** reported no objection.

3.5. The **HSE** recommended limiting working hours to between 8am and 6pm on weekdays and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays in the interests of public health. Condition 10 in the planning authority's decision addressed working hours. Dust deposition should be limited to 350 $\mu\text{m}^2/\text{day}$. The overall quarry is subject to a surface water discharge license which is under review.

3.6. The **Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht** recommended a survey of the site by a qualified ecologist to identify invasive species. Condition 11 of the planning authority's decision addressed this issue.

4.0 **Planning History**

PL26.245934 the proposed development comprises the retention of an existing concrete batching plant with maximum height of 16.5m, an existing concrete batching plant with a maximum height of 16.81m and associated block yard, existing laboratory/batching control office, admixture store, aggregate storage shed and garage, all other related ancillary activities to include a washout lagoon and water storage tank on an area of 1.1ha at Brownswood "Old Quarry", Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford.

In this case the Board amended conditions in relation to noise and dust emissions.

PL26.245932 the proposed development comprised the erection of a concrete batching plant, with maximum height of 13.65m, associated truck wash out area, closed water

management system and ancillary facilities on an area of circa 0.4ha within the Brownswood “Old Quarry”, Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford.

In this case the Board imposed amended conditions in relation to noise and dust deposition.

PL26.245927 related to the erection of a concrete batching plant, with maximum height of 13.65m, associated truck wash out area, closed water management system and ancillary facilities on an area of circa 0.4ha within the Brownswood “Old Quarry”, Brownswood, Enniscorthy, County Wexford. The Board attached amended conditions in relation to noise and dust emissions.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

5.2. The Wexford County Development Plan 2013-2019 (life time extended) in the relevant County Development Plan for the area.

5.3. Objective ED11

5.4. To ensure that extractive industry developments are sited, designed and operated in accordance with best practice. Cognisance should be paid to the following guideline documents (as may be superseded and/or updated) which are of particular relevance:

- Environmental Management in the Extractive Industry (EPA, 2006),
- Quarries and Ancillary Activities: Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DEHLG, 2004),
- Wildlife, Habitats and the Extractive Industry (Notice Nature/ Irish Concrete Federation / NPWS 2010),
- The Environmental Code (ICF, 2006),
- Geological Heritage Guidelines for the Extractive Industry (ICF and GSI, 2008),
- Archaeological Code of Practice (ICF and DEHLG, 2009)

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

Not relevant.

5.6. EIA Screening

- 5.7. The applicant submitted an EIA screening assessment with the application. (see Malone O'Reagan's Environmental Report). The Screening Report states that the proposed development is not within a class in Part 1 of Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, and therefore submission of an EIAR and undertaking and EIA is not mandatory. I agree with this point. The Screening Report states that the proposed development may be considered to fall into Class 10(a) Infrastructure projects: industrial estate development project where the area would exceed 15ha. The report points out that the area of the application at 1.1ha is well below the threshold of 15ha but concludes that a subthreshold screening process having regard to the criteria set out in appendix 7 should be conducted and that process is documented in Appendix B at the back of the report.
- 5.8. The subthreshold screening process applies the criteria set out in schedule 7¹ of the regulations and provides an assessment in Table A2 of the appendix. The subthreshold screening process concludes that there are no likely significant effects arising from the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7. I have read and considered the material submitted with the application and having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development the subject of this application and the criteria set out in Schedule 7 I agree with the conclusion reached by the applicant that the proposed development does not trigger the requirement for the submission of a subthreshold EIAR and carrying out of an EIA.
- 5.9. For completeness on this issue I note Schedule 5 Part 2 Class 2 (a) which provides that the extraction of stone, gravel, sand or clay where the area of extraction would be greater than 5 ha requires EIA. The proposed development is not for the extraction of stone, gravel, sand or clay nor does the area of the application exceed 5ha. On this basis I conclude that the proposed development does not trigger the

¹ Magnitude and spatial extent of the impact, nature of the impact, transboundary impacts, intensity and complexity of the impacts, probability of the impact, expected on set, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact, the cumulation of the impact with other existing/proposed developments and possibility of effectively reducing the impact.

requirement for a mandatory EIAR and carrying out of an EIA. Furthermore having regard to the criteria for triggering the requirement for the submission of an EIAR for subthreshold development set out in Schedule 7 and summarised in the EIA Screening report submitted with the application I conclude that the proposed development will not give rise to likely significant environmental impacts and therefore that the application does not require submission of an EIAR and carrying out of an EIA.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The existing quarry is operated under planning register reference 2015049 which includes condition number 7 as follows;

'Dust levels at the site boundary shall not exceed 350 milligrams per square metre per day averaged over a continuous period of 30 days (Bergerhoff Gauge). Details of a monitoring programme for dust shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Details to be submitted shall include monitoring locations, commencement date and the frequency of monitoring results, and details of all dust suppression measures.'

This condition reflects the advice set out in the relevant Guidelines.

- Conditions 7 and 8 do not accord with the DOEHLG Guidelines for Quarries 2004 or the EPA Guidelines 2006.
- The Board should delete condition 7 and amend condition 8 to refer to the monitoring of noise and dust levels in accordance with the German TA Luft Air Quality Standard (Bergerhoff Gauge method).

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- The overall quarry has three areas of extraction. The present application relates to a concrete making facility in the north-western corner of the site.

- Condition 7 is necessary to protect air quality in the area, has been applied to previous permissions and ensures proper liaison between the developer and the planning authority.
- Condition 8 requires dust monitoring at 15-minute intervals as against the applicant's proposed 30-day averaging. This more stringent method is required having regard to the scale of the quarry operation and the potential for dust generation especially in dry and windy weather.

6.3. Observations

- None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Background

7.2. When, as in the present case, an applicant for permission makes an appeal against conditions imposed by the planning authority in a decision to grant planning permission it is open to the Board to consider that application *de novo* or to confine its consideration of the conditions appealed. In the present case the overall quarry of about 39ha was subject to EIA and a grant of permission under PL26.202259. Subsequently three further applications were made on the site under reference numbers PL26.245934, PL26.245932 and PL26.245927. Those three appeals related to the appropriateness of conditions imposed by the planning authority in relation to noise and dust

7.3. The current application is within the footprint of the application under **PL26.245934** and arises from condition 2 of the planning authority's grant of permission in that case which required that operations at the concrete ready mix plant should cease on the last day of 2020 and that the structure be removed by end of 2021. Having regard to the assessments carried out (including by the Board in PL26.202259, the planning authority under reference numbers 20150497/ PL26.245934, 20150496/ PL26.245927 and 20150809/PL26.245932), the nature of the application as a continuation of an existing permitted use I conclude that no additional planning impacts arise from the proposed development over and above those already

assessed (including on visual and residential amenity, traffic and water quality) and I recommend that the Board may confine itself to consideration of the conditions appealed in this case.

7.4. In this case conditions 6, 7 and 8 of the planning authority's must be read together.

7.5. **Condition 6 – Not appealed**

The total dust emissions arising from the on-site operations when measured at any point along the site boundary (boundary with land not owned or under the applicant's control) shall not exceed 350 milligrams per square meter per day in accordance with German TA Luft Air Quality Standard.

Stockpiles of materials relating to the development shall be suitably enclosed and/or relocated in accordance with a detailed proposals for such to be agreed by the planning authority if this dust emission limit is being breached as a result of open air stock piles.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.

7.6. **Condition 7 – appealed.**

7.7. Condition number 7 is as follows;

Total Suspended Particles arising from the on-site operations when measured at any point along the site boundary (boundary with the land not owned or under the applicant's control) shall not exceed 150ug/m³ over a 24-hour averaging time period. Stockpiles of materials relating to the development shall be suitably enclosed and/or relocated in accordance with the detailed proposals for such to be agreed by the planning authority if this TSP emission limit is being breached as a result of open air stockpiles.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.

7.8. The appeal makes the point that the terms of the condition do not reflect the advice set out in the DOECLG Quarries Guidelines or the EPA Environmental Management in the Extractive Industry (Non-Scheduled Minerals) Guidelines. The planning authority commented in relation to the appeal that the site is surrounded by agricultural land, public roads road and houses which require special protection from dust deposition.

- 7.9. The EPA Environmental Management in the Extractive Industry (Non-Scheduled Minerals) does not refer to 'Total Suspended Particles' (TSP's) but only to 'dust' and comments (paragraph 3.4.2) that "the impact of dust is usually monitored by measuring rates of dust deposition (DoE, 1995). There are currently no Irish statutory standards or EPA guidelines relating specifically to dust deposition thresholds for inert mineral dust. There are a number of methods to measure dust deposition but only the German TA Luft Air Quality Standards (TA Luft, 1986) specify a method of measuring dust deposition – The Bergerhoff Method (German Standard VDI 2119, 1972) – with dust nuisance. It is the only enforceable method available. Where this method is deemed unsuitable for use, and only in these circumstances, an alternative method may be agreed with the local authority".
- 7.10. The Board considered the appropriate method of dust control in relation to this concrete batching plant and associated works under PL26.245934 and preferred the EPA Guidance to the planning authority's condition number 6 which had also referred to TSPs. I do not consider that the location of the application site close to roads, agricultural land or houses is a convincing rationale for departing from the EPA Guidance on this point. I recommend therefore that condition number 7 be amended as set out in the draft order below.
- 7.11. **Condition 8 - Appealed.**

Noise, dust and suspended particles generated by the development site shall be monitored in accordance with a detailed scheme for such which has been submitted for the agreement of the planning authority within 2 months of the final date of decision (unless as otherwise agreed with the planning authority).

Monitoring shall be carried out by suitably qualified persons. Dust is to be monitored utilising continuous monitoring equipment with 15-minute averaging internals, which are capable of continuously indicating the concentration of Total Suspended Particulates and PM10.

The planning authority reserve the right to seek/accept changes in the monitoring regime in the light of the results received and any changes in operations at the site.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and proper planning and sustainable development.

- 7.12. This condition is the same as was appealed against in PL26.245934 where the Board removed this condition and imposed separate conditions for noise emissions and dust emissions. The applicant makes similar points in relation to this condition that it does not comply with the DOEHLG Quarries Guidelines and the EPA guidance. I have considered the planning authority's response to the appeal but I consider that there are no extraordinary circumstances in relation to the proximity of this quarry to houses, agricultural lands or public roads which would merit a departure from the established guidance on the matter of noise or dust emissions.
- 7.13. Having regard to the earlier decision dealing with this batching plant under PL26.245934, to the advice set out in the EPA Management Guidelines Environmental Management in the Extractive Industry (Non-Scheduled Minerals), to the grounds of appeal and the planning authority's response thereto I consider that these three conditions be considered together and that two new conditions be imposed dealing separately with noise and dust as set out in the draft order below.
- 7.14. **Appropriate Assessment – Screening.**
- 7.15. It may be noted that the elements of the proposed development proposed for retention (continued use of an existing concrete batching plant, including mixer house (12.2m high) two associated silos (16.5m high) 4 aggregate storage bins (12.49m high) and ancillary infrastructure as authorised under permission PL26.245934 (PA reg reference 20150497) have been subject to Appropriate Assessment screening previously under PL26.245934 and the Board was satisfied that those elements would not be likely to have had, and will not be likely to have, a significant effect, individually or in combination with other plans and projects, on the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (site code 000781) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobbs Special Protection Area (site code 004076), or any other European sites, in view of the sites' conservation objectives.
- 7.16. This application (both the elements to be retained and the new elements) was accompanied by an NIS and therefore the Board must carry out an Appropriate Assessment. The new elements comprise one new silo (16.5m high) and 1 aggregate bin (12.49m high), along with improved on-site drainage by the installation of a new settlement tank (537m³) and associated ancillary works.

- 7.17. The European sites identified within a 15kms radius of the application site are the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (site code 000781), the Screen Hills SAC and the Wexford Harbour and Slobs Special Protection Area (site code 004076). Having regard to the location of the application proximate to these sites I agree that they are correctly identified as potential receptors for impacts.
- 7.18. The AA screening report accompanying the application screened out the Screen Hills SAC from further consideration having regard to the separation distance (13kms) and the absence of a hydrological connection between the application site and the SAC. Having regard to these factors (distance and lack of hydrological connection) and, additionally, having regard to the conservation objective to maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the qualifying interests (Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (*Littorelletalia uniflorae*) and European dry heaths of the for which the Screen Hills SAC has been designated) I conclude that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, individually or in combination with other plans and projects, on Screen Hills SAC (000708) or any other European site, in view of the site's conservation objectives.
- 7.19. The AA screening report submitted with the application concluded that having regard to the proximity of the application site to the two remaining European sites that it would not be safe to exclude the possibility of significant effects on the Slaney River Valley Special Area of Conservation (site code 000781) and the Wexford Harbour and Slobs Special Protection Area (site code 004076) and I agree with this conclusion.
- 7.20. **Appropriate Assessment Stage 2.**
- 7.21. The conservation objective for the **Slaney River Valley SAC (000781)** is the maintenance of the favourable conservation condition of the habitats and species (qualifying interests) for which the site has been designated. The qualifying interests of the Slaney River Valley SAC (000781) are;
- Freshwater Pearl Mussel *Margaritifera margaritifera*
 - Sea Lamprey *Petromyzon marinus*
 - Brook Lamprey *Lampetra planeri*
 - River Lamprey *Lampetra fluviatilis*

- Twaite Shad *Alosa fallax*
- Atlantic Salmon *Salmo salar* (only in fresh water)
- Estuaries
- Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide
- Otter *Lutra lutra*
- Harbour Seal *Phoca vitulina*
- Water courses of plain to montane levels with the *Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitriche-Batrachion* vegetation
- Old sessile oak woods with *Ilex* and *Blechnum* in the British Isles
- Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*).

7.22. The NIS in table 6-1 identifies an absence of likely significant effects on the Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide, Old sessile oak woods with *Ilex* and *Blechnum* in the British Isles and the Alluvial forests with *Alnus glutinosa* and *Fraxinus excelsior* (*Alno-Padion*, *Alnion incanae*, *Salicion albae*) because these habitats are distant from the application site.

7.23. Table 6-1 includes the remaining qualifying interests when considering adverse effects. The NIS concludes that having regard to the nature of the application site outside any European site and the nature of the application site as buildings and artificial surfaces there is no loss or disturbance of habitats or species. In relation to the impairment of water quality and therefore a potential for adverse impact on water dependent species the NIS report makes the point that an existing licenced discharge to the River Slaney will be ended and a new closed loop water recycling system that meets the production/wheel wash and other water needs of the proposed development will break an existing hydrological connection between the application site and the SAC. This factor and the detailed construction environment management plan will ensure that there are no adverse effects on the SAC.

7.24. I have conducted a site inspection, considered the material published by the NPWS and the material submitted with the application, in particular the NIS and I conclude that the proposed development will not adversely effect Slaney River Valley SAC

(000781) having regard to the conservation objectives for the site and the qualifying interests.

7.25. The conservation objective for the **Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA** (004076) is the maintenance of the favourable conservation condition of the species (qualifying interests) for which the site has been designated. The qualifying interests of the are;

- Little Grebe *Tachybaptus ruficollis*
- Great Crested Grebe *Podiceps cristatus*
- Cormorant *Phalacrocorax carbo*
- Grey Heron *Ardea cinerea*
- Bewick's Swan *Cygnus columbianus*
- Whooper Swan *Cygnus cygnus*
- Light-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla hrota*
- Shelduck *Tadorna tadorna*
- Wigeon *Anas penelope*
- Teal *Anas crecca*
- Mallard *Anas platyrhynchos*
- Pintail *Anas acuta*
- Scaup *Aythya marila*
- Goldeneye *Bucephala clangula*
- Red-breasted Merganser *Mergus serrator*
- Hen Harrier *Circus cyaneus*
- Coot *Fulica atra*
- Oystercatcher *Haematopus ostralegus*
- Golden Plover *Pluvialis apricaria*
- Grey Plover *Pluvialis squatarola*
- Lapwing *Vanellus vanellus*

- Knot *Calidris canutus*
- Sanderling *Calidris alba*
- Dunlin *Calidris alpina* wintering
- Black-tailed Godwit *Limosa limosa*
- Bar-tailed Godwit *Limosa lapponica*
- Curlew *Numenius arquata*
- Redshank *Tringa totanus*
- Black-headed Gull *Chroicocephalus ridibundus*
- Lesser Black-backed Gull *Larus fuscus*
- Little Tern *Sterna albifrons*
- Greenland White-fronted goose *Anser albifrons flavirostris*
- Wetlands

7.26. Table 6-3 in the NIS sets out the qualifying interests of the SPA and concludes that having regard to the nature of the application site as an industrial and quarry landscape that it is of low ecological importance and the proposed development will not give rise to significant effects on the bird species which comprise the qualifying interests of the SPA. Having regard to the factors set out in the NIS (in particular the long history of anthropogenic activity on the site) I agree with this conclusion that the proposed development is not likely to have a have an significant effect on these species.

7.27. Table 6-3 goes on to conclude that it cannot be concluded that there is not the possibility of significant effects on wetlands which are a qualifying interest for which the SPA has been designated.

7.28. The NIS considered the factors which may give rise to adverse effects on the SPA and identifies these as loss or disturbance or habitats or species and impairment of water quality. Since the application site does not include any wetlands it is concluded that there are no adverse effects on the SPA arising from this factor. In relation to water quality it is noted that there is currently a licenced water discharge from the site to the River Slaney which will be discontinued as a result of this proposed

development thereby removing a potential source of water pollution. Having regard to this factor and the mitigation measures set out in the NIS it is concluded that there will be no adverse effects on wetlands for which the SPA has been designated.

- 7.29. Having regard to the information on the file, including the NIS, which I consider adequate in order to carry out a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment, I conclude that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not adversely affect the integrity of the Wexford Harbour and Slobs SPA (004076) or the Slaney River Valley SAC (000781) or any other European site, in view of the sites' Conservation Objectives.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. I recommend that the Board deal with this appeal under section 139 of the Planning and Development Act as follows; remove condition number 8 and amend conditions 5 and 7 as follows.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Quarries and Ancillary Activities Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DOEHLG 2004) and the Environmental Management in the Extractive Industry Non-Scheduled Guidelines (EPA 2006), to the existing established nature of the quarrying operation within the site and on adjoining lands in the ownership of the applicant, the location of the application site relative to nearby residential properties and to the N11 national primary route, the Board considered that the conditions, as originally imposed by the planning authority, should be altered as set out in this order.

10.0 Conditions

5	<p>During the operation of the proposed development the noise level from the operations measured at the site boundaries shall not exceed:-</p> <p>(i) an Laeq (1 hour) value of 55 dB(A) during the period 0800 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Saturday,</p> <p>(ii) an Laeq (1 hour) value of 45 dB(A) at any other time.</p> <p>All sound measurements shall be carried out in accordance with the ISO recommendations 1996 (assessment of noise with respect to community response) as amended by ISO Recommendations 1996/1, 2 and 3 (description and measurement of environmental noise (as appropriate)).</p> <p>All machinery and vehicles employed on the site and the conveyor shall be fitted with effective silencers of a type appropriate to the specification and at all times the best available technology, not entailing excessive costs, shall be employed to prevent or counteract defects of noise emitted by vehicles, plant machinery or otherwise arising from the site activities.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the properties in the vicinity of the site.</p>
7	<p>(a) Dust levels at the site boundary shall not exceed 350 milligrams per square metre per day averaged over a continuous period of 30 days (Bergerhoff Gauge). Details of a monitoring programme for dust shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Details to be submitted shall include monitoring locations, commencement date and the frequency of monitoring results, and details of all dust suppression measures.</p> <p>(b) A monthly survey and monitoring programme of dust emissions shall be undertaken to provide for compliance with these limits. Details of this programme, including the location of dust monitoring stations, and details of dust suppression measures to be carried out within the site, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of any quarrying works on the site. This programme shall include an annual review of all dust monitoring data, to be undertaken by a</p>

	<p>suitably qualified person acceptable to the planning authority. The results of the reviews shall be submitted to the planning authority within two weeks of completion. The developer shall carry out any amendments to the programme required by the planning authority following this annual review.</p> <p>Reason: To control dust emissions arising from the development, in the interest of the amenity of the area.</p>
--	---

Hugh Mannion
Senior Planning Inspector

6th April 2021