

1 RHONDDA CYNON TAF COUNCIL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

2 Minutes of the virtual meeting of the  
3 Planning and Development Committee held on  
4 Thursday, 9 July 2020 at 3.00 pm.

5  
6 County Borough Councillors - Planning and Development  
7 Committee Members in attendance:-

8 Councillor S Rees (Chair)

9 Councillor G Caple Councillor J Bonetto  
10 Councillor P Jarman Councillor D Grehan  
11 Councillor G Hughes Councillor J Williams  
12 Councillor W Owen Councillor R Yeo  
13 Councillor D Williams Councillor S Powderhill

14 Officers in attendance:-

15 Mr C Hanagan, Service Director of Democratic Services &  
16 Communication  
17 Mr S Gale, Director of Prosperity & Development  
18 Mr J Bailey, Head of Planning  
19 Mr S Zeinali, Highways Development Control Manager  
20 Mr S Humphreys, Head of Legal Services  
21 Mr H Towns - Minerals and Waste Planning Manager  
22 Mr N Pilliner, Environmental Protection and Housing Standards  
23 Manager  
24 Mr G Purnell, Pollution Control Officer

25 County Borough Councillors in attendance:-

Councillor R Bevan, Councillor H Fychan,  
Councillor S Pickering and Councillor M Powell

- - - - -

21 (Transcript of a digital recording by  
22 Marten Walsh Cherer Limited, 2nd Floor, Quality House,  
23 6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1HP.  
24 Telephone No: 020 7067 2900. DX 410 LDE.  
25 Email: info@martenwalshcherer.com. www.martenwalshcherer.com)

- - - - -

1  
2 THE CHAIR: Thank you, members, good afternoon and welcome to  
3 everyone. Are there any declarations of interest?

4 COUNCILLOR D WILLIAMS: Chair, I would like to declare a personal  
5 and prejudicial request on Application No: 15/0666/10. It is  
6 prejudicial and personal because I am involved with the action  
7 group that is against the extension of the quarry.

8 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Councillor Williams. Can we get a motion  
9 for the Human Rights Act, please?

10 A SPEAKER: I move.

11 A SPEAKER: Second.

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you, and the Wellbeing of Future Generations  
13 Act?

14 A SPEAKER: I move.

15 A SPEAKER: Second.

16 THE CHAIR: Okay, we will move on then. There is only one item  
17 that we are considering here this afternoon and that is  
18 Application No: 15/0666/10. This a western extension to the  
19 existing quarry to include the phased extraction of an  
20 additional 10 million tonnes of pennant sandstone. This at  
21 Craig Yr Hesg quarry, and this is a Craig Yr Hesg Quarry,  
22 Quarry road, Berw Road, Pontypridd.

23 We have got local members who have indicated they wanted  
24 to speak on this item. Councillor Mike Powell was the first  
25 to indicate. Is Councillor Powell with us? No, he is not

1 with us. Well, Councillor Fychan is with us, so I will call  
2 Councillor Fychan now. Councillor Fychan, you have five  
3 minutes to address the Committee when you are ready.

4 COUNCILLOR FYCHAN: Thank you very much for your time. Obviously,  
5 we have gone through the arguments in February so I do not  
6 want to rehearse those. The only thing I would say is that  
7 there is a huge amount of strength and opposition locally to  
8 this throughout Pontypridd. I think the comments have been  
9 summarised in the report, but I am not sure if you, as  
10 Committee members, have also seen the photographs submitted  
11 and all those letters. I believe there are hundreds of  
12 letters received and I think they are extremely powerful.  
13 They are being shared on social media. You can see the impact  
14 of this on people who are living with the effects of the  
15 quarry day in, day out.

16 We heard reference to the Wellbeing of Future  
17 Generations Act and I think that was the one we were mindful  
18 of last time this was discussed at Committee, but this is a  
19 25-year expansion to a quarry where it was promised to the  
20 community that this would not happen again, that this would be  
21 the end of the life of the quarry.

22 I note the comments relating, in the report, around the  
23 LBP, but we must be conscious that the LBP ends in 2021 and  
24 from the report, it is only for ten years post that LBP that  
25 we must have the reserves in place. It also notes in the

1 report that there is no shortage of supply (*unclear due to*  
2 *audio distortion*) so I think we need to take into account that  
3 things have changed significantly since that LBP was written  
4 and that we do now have (*unclear due to audio distortion*).

5 Along with that, we have a Clean Air Plan for Wales  
6 which is currently under consultation. This ended in March  
7 and obviously some of that progression has been delayed due to  
8 COVID-19, but that will change acceptable levels of pollution  
9 and clean air. I think we need to take into account that this  
10 is imminent in terms of changes and would have a bearing in  
11 terms of any future decisions.

12 In terms of the impact on other areas beyond Glyncoch,  
13 we have heard that there are proposals to create a screening  
14 and a noise barrier between the extended area in Glyncoch, but  
15 I just want to draw your attention that this will not make a  
16 difference to some of the areas that are also suffering noise  
17 pollution. Only last Friday, a major blast was felt from the  
18 quarry in Graigwen, White Rock in Pontypridd, where it was  
19 felt and heard. So, this is a real concern for residents if  
20 it is going to be extended.

21 In terms of Berw Road, I am disappointed in the report,  
22 that the data on page 38 is from 2012 and 2013, and there has  
23 not been a more recent survey undertaken. I think anybody who  
24 uses or spends time on Berw Road would say that traffic has  
25 increased from the quarry and I would urge that we need a more

1 up-to-date report rather than rely on data that is outdated at  
2 the moment.

3 There are also concerns that there have been breaches of  
4 previous environmental conditions. You can see clouds of  
5 dust. If you have seen the photograph, there are clouds of  
6 dust on a regular basis from the area. Obviously, we know as  
7 well, in terms of health concerns, that there are high levels  
8 of respiratory problems with children and COPD in the area  
9 affected so I think we really do need to ask.

10 We are told here that society needs these minerals.  
11 I stress we do not need these if it has human cost and for our  
12 community. There is very little benefit from this development  
13 for our community. All I can see are risks to health and  
14 wellbeing which are not in line with the Wellbeing of Future  
15 Generations Act and I urge you to stick with your decision in  
16 February and support local residents in opposing this  
17 expansion of the quarry, which would be for 25 years and  
18 completely unacceptable for our community.

19 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Councillor Fychan. Is Councillor Powell  
20 with us?

21 COUNCILLOR POWELL: Yes, I am indeed, Chair. I have just come  
22 from a group leaders' Zoom meeting.

23 THE CHAIR: Okay. Councillor Powell, just by means of  
24 explanation, we have started the meeting. As you know, we are  
25 only dealing with the one item today, which is the item that

1 came first to the Committee back in February, and you have  
2 indicated that you would like to speak again today on this  
3 item. So, you have got five minutes to address Committee when  
4 you are ready.

5 COUNCILLOR POWELL: Thank you very much, Chair. I would have been  
6 slightly better prepared if I had not just come from a group  
7 leaders' meeting and caught just part of Councillor Fychan's  
8 very eloquent reasoning for the continuation for the Committee  
9 to actually refuse this planning application.

10 I am fully in support of Councillor Fychan's call.  
11 I think it would be hugely detrimental to the impact of the  
12 health and wellbeing not just of the people of Glyncoch, but  
13 also to the people of Cilfynydd, who are predominantly  
14 westerly, with the particles of dust. I have observed it  
15 myself fairly recently on a clear day and it had a sort of  
16 south-westerly wind. There had been some blasting at the  
17 quarry. I did take some photographs, which I was going to try  
18 and get together for this meeting, but you could actually see  
19 the clouds of dust moving over Glyncoch itself. If we are  
20 going to actually expand this, or allow it to expand, it is  
21 not a case that there would be more dust. There will be the  
22 same problem with the amount of dust, but over a longer period  
23 of time, and I do not think it is fair to the residents of  
24 Glyncoch to put up with that.

25 We also have the issue with the vehicles using Berw Road

1 to access the A470. They come through Councillor Williams'  
2 ward initially, Councillor Fychan's ward, and through my ward  
3 and then down the A470. The number and the volume of the  
4 vehicles will increase. We are talking 44-tonne lorries,  
5 which put an awful lot of pollution into the atmosphere. That  
6 atmosphere, because we are in the bottom of the valley, is  
7 expanding and to a degree dissipating, but it is not; it is  
8 really covering more areas at the bottom of the valleys where  
9 we have a lot of people living in forest area, in the  
10 Cilfynydd area, down in through Hawthorn.

11 We have seen that the Welsh Assembly Government have  
12 implemented a 50 mile an hour speed limit on the A470 in our  
13 area to reduce the emissions. This application, if it was to  
14 progress, is not going to do that. It is just going to  
15 increase the problems with the emissions. It is going to  
16 increase the traffic congestion in the area, which is not  
17 particularly good at the moment. I know there are things that  
18 could be done to ameliorate it.

19 We did have an application before us, before quite a few  
20 members' time, but I am sure Councillor Jarman will remember  
21 the Beverley Fields Mill Farm Pontypridd. There is a  
22 photograph of the proposed link road across from Glyncoch to  
23 the A470 in Cilfynydd, which would perhaps have ameliorated  
24 the traffic issues, but it is still not going to ameliorate  
25 the problems with the dust in that small locality. That is

1 one of the reasons, I think, we should continue to oppose  
2 this. Mr. Bailey is aware that I have asked for the full  
3 report because I can remember, as Councillor Jarman probably  
4 does, making decisions on that application, which failed.  
5 Nevertheless, there was one bonus coming out of it, which was  
6 the cross-valley link. We are really in a position now where  
7 we have feelings with this coronavirus, where, from the point  
8 of traffic on our roads, what do we do? We have the  
9 opportunity to actually implement decisions not for now, but  
10 for the next 30 or 40 years, and by granting this application,  
11 I think it would be really detrimental to what we really  
12 should be looking at for the benefit of the people living in  
13 Pontypridd now, which will impact upon them for 30 years. I  
14 know Councillor Fychan mentioned 25, but it is not going to be  
15 25, it would be 30, it could be 50 years' time. That is  
16 something which we have got to consider now because once it  
17 has started, there is no stopping this. It is just going to  
18 roll and roll.

19 So, I hope the Committee actually stands by the decision  
20 it made back in February and votes against this planning  
21 application. Then the officers will be able to have the  
22 information at hand as I am sure they will have to deal with  
23 the Welsh Assembly with an appeal made to them to see whether  
24 or not they continue with this planning application or they  
25 let it go forward and reverse our decision.



1           Thank you very much, Chair, for allowing me to comment  
2           on this application to your Committee. Thank you.

3   THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Powell. Councillor  
4           Pickering?

5   COUNCILLOR PICKERING: Thank you, Chair. As you know, Ynysybwl  
6           neighbours Glyncoch and a primary concern for me and residents  
7           of Ynysybwl is the highways issue. If anybody living in  
8           Ynysybwl needs to access school, hospital, work or the  
9           crematorium, we have to go through Pontypridd. This means  
10          passing Craig Yr Hesg Quarry and travelling down Berw Road on  
11          to the traffic lights at the police station. It is one way in  
12          and one way out. You need to navigate through the traffic  
13          pinch points at the bottom and top end of Berw Road and the  
14          build-up at the lights.

15          Prior to lockdown and following the damage caused by  
16          Storm Dennis in February and the necessary closure of the  
17          White Bridge leading in to Trallwn, the traffic queue at the  
18          lights was backing up as far as Glyncoch at peak times and  
19          there were daily, certainly hourly complaints, to be honest.  
20          The White Bridge, obviously, was used as a route to avoid the  
21          lights and is likely to be out of use for quite some time now,  
22          as we know. So, delays once again will affect the lives of  
23          residents living in Ynysybwl and Glyncoch as we gradually  
24          return to normality.

25          Huge 44-tonne lorries, often moving in convoy, with

1 evidence, I understand, of 277 vehicular movements per week,  
2 will add to this traffic nightmare. I have sat there  
3 personally and witnessed only one lorry moving through the  
4 lights on green at a time -- one vehicle at a time, with a  
5 huge queue of people behind it, trying to go about their  
6 business. 44-tonne lorries travelling along narrow already  
7 congested roads are causing havoc and, in my opinion, causing  
8 a huge safety risk.

9 I feel the children going to school from Ynysybwl and  
10 Glyncoch and Pontypridd High (unclear) and Pontsion Norton  
11 often face huge delays, children as young as three years' old  
12 with regards to Pontsion Norton, sitting on the bus for very  
13 long periods of time and more often than not being late for  
14 school. I fear people trying to attend hospital appointments  
15 will be late and possibly miss these long-awaited  
16 appointments. I fear that a funeral cortege will be stuck in  
17 congested traffic, stuck at the lights in Pontypridd on its  
18 way to Glyntaff Crematorium, and will miss its slot entirely,  
19 or the allotted funeral time reduced significantly.

20 Further to my highways concerns, when the wind blows in  
21 a certain way, dust does reach as far as Ynysybwl and if the  
22 proposed extension goes ahead, it will bring the quarry  
23 workings closer to the village posing more of a risk to  
24 residents. Being a former mining village, the elderly  
25 residents of Ynysybwl are not strangers to this dust. My own

1 father, a former miner, had pneumoconiosis. I have seen  
2 firsthand the effects of dust on the lungs and believe me it  
3 is not something I would want to put our children at risk  
4 from. As you are travelling down the A470, you will see signs  
5 saying "Pollution kills" and I can tell you I know what it  
6 does.

7 There is one more thing, if I am allowed to ask this.  
8 I am surprised that my colleague, my neighbouring fellow  
9 Councillor who this affects more directly in terms of air  
10 pollution and blasting, is not able to speak today. Why is  
11 that, please? May I ask that question, please?

12 MR. HUMPHREYS: The answer is that the Code of Conduct prohibits  
13 Councillor Doug Williams from addressing the Committee because  
14 he has declared a personal and prejudicial interest.

15 COUNCILLOR POWELL: Chair, can I have a question, Chair, from the  
16 legal officer?

17 THE CHAIR: Councillor Powell, no, sorry, this is not a question  
18 and answer session.

19 COUNCILLOR POWELL: The officer's information is incorrect, that  
20 the Code of Conduct does not stop him from actually speaking.

21 THE CHAIR: We have already dealt with this matter, Councillor  
22 Powell. This has already been dealt with, with the legal  
23 officer. So, Councillor Pickering, have you finished  
24 your ----

25 COUNCILLOR PICKERING: Yes, sorry. Thank you, Chair.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay. I will hand over to Mr. Humphreys now.

2 MR. HUMPHREYS: Thank you, Chair. At this point I would ask the  
3 Committee to move a resolution that the press and public be  
4 excluded from the meeting under section 100A(4) of the Local  
5 Government Act 1972 in order for the Committee to receive  
6 legal advice in connection with this application, on the  
7 grounds that it will involve a likely disclosure of  
8 information as defined in paragraph 16 of part 4 of Schedule  
9 12A of the Local Government Act 1972; namely, information in  
10 respect of which a claim for legal professional privilege  
11 could be maintained in legal proceedings.

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Humphreys. Well, I so move  
13 that we do go into part 4, then. Is that seconded?

14 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: Second that, Chair.

15 THE CHAIR: Do other members agree that we do that, so we can get  
16 specific legal advice? Yes? Councillor Williams, yes.  
17 Councillor Jarman, yes. Okay, that is agreed.

18 Is everybody present that needs to be present? Yes.  
19 Okay. Just to remind members, then, that we are here this  
20 afternoon to look at a deferred application, original minded 2  
21 decision to refuse the extension of Craig Yr Hesg quarry, Berw  
22 Road, Pontypridd. So I will hand over to Mr. Bailey now to  
23 introduce the report before handing over to Mr. Towns.

24 MR. BAILEY: Thank you, Chair. As you have outlined, this is an  
25 application that came before Committee in February of this

1 year and prior to that some members of Committee attended a  
2 site visit towards the tail end of December in 2019, in order  
3 to observe the site.

4 When this matter came before Committee in February,  
5 there was a long debate, I am sure members will recall, with a  
6 number of public speakers raising strong concerns with the  
7 proposal and there was also representatives there from the  
8 applicant, the agent, SLR representing Hansons. After that  
9 long consideration and debate members voted that they were  
10 clearly minded to refuse the application on three grounds, and  
11 they are set out within the report back.

12 As you have indicated, Chair, Mr. Hugh Towns, who  
13 I introduced to members at that meeting in February, is  
14 present today and he will run through the report which sets  
15 out what we feel to be the relative strengths and weaknesses  
16 of those particular concerns expressed at that meeting.

17 But before I do that, Chair, if I can just run through  
18 some items of late correspondence that we have had in. These  
19 have been circulated to members so I am hoping that members  
20 have had an opportunity to have a look at these. We have had  
21 up until midday today 62 e-mails sent in to us, predominantly  
22 over the last week or so, since the publication of the report  
23 on the Council's website. 60 of those raise objections to the  
24 application and the objections contained within those e-mails  
25 do not really raise any new issues that were not or had not

1 already been expressed at the time of the Committee  
2 consideration in February and refer to issues such as  
3 blasting, air quality, dust, traffic, environmental issues.

4 There are two letters or e-mails in support of the  
5 proposal, Chair.

6 We have also had a re-presented letter from Vikki  
7 Howells AM, this is a copy of the letter that was considered  
8 and presented to members again prior to the meeting in  
9 February and sets out concerns on behalf of her constituents  
10 largely on points to do with the fact that the works would  
11 fall within the 200 metre buffer zone; the fact that blasting  
12 operations already cause significant concerns in the locality;  
13 issues of air pollution; and the increase in traffic.

14 There has been a further e-mail on behalf of Ynysybwl  
15 and Coed-y-Cwm Community Council, which again reiterates  
16 objections to the submission. Then we have two letters from  
17 SLR Consulting who are the planning agent for Hanson in  
18 respect of this application. The first of these, whilst has  
19 been circulated as a late letter, was received in February,  
20 several weeks after the initial Committee meeting, Chair, and  
21 I am sure members have probably read this. It sets out  
22 Hanson's disappointment at the earlier Committee resolution,  
23 and identifies the fact there were no technical objections  
24 from any statutory consultees. It seeks to set out the  
25 benefits that may flow from the application and the benefits

1 that Hanson's feel they have dedicated to the community during  
2 the course of the quarry working to date. They also set out  
3 in that letter, which is the letter I think Councillor  
4 Powderhill probably referred to, where they confirm that they  
5 would be, should the Council refuse the application, pursuing  
6 the matter to appeal and seeking an award of costs against the  
7 Council.

8 The second letter is the one more recently received in  
9 the last few days, 7th July and that notes that the report to  
10 committee today identifies one reason for refusal, having  
11 considered the strengths and weaknesses of the concerns  
12 expressed in February. In the view of Hanson's agent, they  
13 feel that matter could be dealt with by a condition, if that  
14 was members' sole reason of concern -- and Hugh will come on  
15 to deal with that view -- and also they have suggested, as the  
16 recommendation notes, an additional condition were members  
17 minded to approve, an additional condition limiting output  
18 from the quarry to 400,000 tonnes per annum. SLR have sought  
19 a condition that effectively averages the tonnage output over  
20 a three-year period. Again, perhaps you will comment on that,  
21 but that is not a version of that condition in the wording  
22 they presented in the letter, which we would support and  
23 recommend to members.

24 So, those are the late letters that we have had, Chair.  
25 Perhaps, as Hugh speaks, I will ask Bethan to put the plans

1 up, so members are reminded of the proximity of the site to  
2 those nearest properties in Glyncoch and you can see exactly  
3 where the extension is to the west of the existing quarry.

4 Thank you.

5 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. Mr. Towns, can I call you in there?

6 MR. TOWNS: Okay, Chair, can everybody hear me? Just make sure.

7 Right. The report that has been put before members seeks to  
8 address the relative strengths and weaknesses of the concerns  
9 identified by members at the February Committee and these are  
10 dealt with in turn in the report and they relate to adverse  
11 health impacts due to air quality, adverse amenity impacts of  
12 not providing a 200 metre buffer zone and damage to the  
13 highway network.

14 First of all, in relation to health and air quality, the  
15 report does recognise the concerns that have been put forward  
16 by objectors in relation to concerns about poor air quality,  
17 and it is recognised as being an environmental risk to public  
18 health where there is poor air quality. Unfortunately, from a  
19 point of view of the objectors, the position that has been  
20 adopted by Public Health Wales and the Cwn Taf University  
21 Health Board is that there is no poor air quality in Glyncoch  
22 at the present time. In fact, the Public Health Wales  
23 specifically in their consultation response identified air  
24 quality within Glyncoch as being good and as being good with  
25 the quarry already operating within the area. Therefore, the



1 extension of the quarry and continuation of operations would  
2 not adversely affect air quality over and above its current  
3 situation.

4 Secondly, another weakness of the case in relation to  
5 air quality and health impact is the national air quality  
6 objectives, which provide pragmatic public health safeguards.  
7 The latest air quality progress report indicates that air  
8 quality objectives within Glyncoch are being met, and the  
9 level of pollutants is approximately 50% of the standard;  
10 therefore, well within air quality objectives standards.

11 Thirdly, as I have mentioned previously, Public Health  
12 Wales and the University Health Board have indicated that air  
13 quality is good and then based on current levels of activities  
14 adverse air quality impacts and human health impacts are  
15 unlikely.

16 With that position, by Public Health Wales and Cwn Taf  
17 University Health Board, it would be very difficult to  
18 substantiate a reason for air quality and health impacts if  
19 that is their position.

20 What the report does go on to say is that they did base  
21 that on current levels of activity. So, current levels of  
22 activity being in the region of 400,000 tonnes per annum and  
23 the environmental statement having assessed the impact based  
24 on 400,000 tonnes per annum, an additional condition would be  
25 warranted setting a limit of 400,000 tonnes per annum.

1           It has been suggested by SLR, the agents for the  
2 applicant, that they would accept a condition averaging  
3 400,000 tonnes over a three-year period, 400,000 tonnes per  
4 annum over a three-year period. That would be unacceptable on  
5 the basis that it does not safeguard the position and ensure  
6 that the current levels of activity are maintained. By having  
7 an average it would allow them to close down for a year and  
8 have 600,000 tonnes per annum potentially for two years.

9           Now, that is a position that the Council would not be  
10 able to put itself in, because it would not safeguard the  
11 community from levels of activity that would be higher than  
12 the current levels, and Public Health Wales and the University  
13 Health Board have not commented on higher levels, so we could  
14 not be certain that their position would not change.

15           Based on that additional condition, there are three  
16 there significant weaknesses to a refusal on the grounds of  
17 the impact on health and air quality and it is not considered  
18 by officers that a reason for refusal on that basis could be  
19 justified or substantiated.

20           I am going to move on to highways secondly. Previously,  
21 members indicated concerns in relation to damage to the  
22 highway infrastructure as a reason for refusal. The report  
23 highlights the number of traffic movements on the B4273  
24 associated with the quarry. The numbers associated with the  
25 quarry are relatively limited. They are 140 vehicle movements

1 per day, which would be 70 in and 70 out for HGVs, and that is  
2 out of a total of 847 on the road system. So, the quarry  
3 contributes 16.5% of the HGV movements along that road.

4 Now, if you look at the total number of vehicles along  
5 that road, 11,600, the contribution made by the quarry is  
6 about 1.2% of the total number of traffic movements which is  
7 extremely small. So, in terms of the damage that 1.2% of the  
8 traffic movements would create on the public highway, that  
9 would be insignificant in our view and would not justify a  
10 reason for refusal on that basis.

11 The report does go on to consider that HGV movements  
12 manoeuvring in and out of the entrance would have the  
13 potential to adversely affect the highway infrastructure in  
14 that entrance location. However, the section 59 of the  
15 Highways Act 1980 gives the local authority power to remedy  
16 such damage and recover their costs from the site operator  
17 should such damage occur. Therefore, damage could occur but  
18 the remedy already exists in law without refusing this  
19 application to allow the Council to remedy the situation  
20 without being out of pocket.

21 So, in terms of damage to the highway, again, with the  
22 limited number of lorry movements relative to the amount of  
23 traffic on that road, and the fact that there is a remedy to  
24 any damage in the entrance from the manoeuvring of vehicles,  
25 again significant weaknesses to that argument; and, again, we

1 do not think as officers that could be justified were we  
2 challenged.

3 The third reason that was put forward by members related  
4 to the proposed extension extending within 200 metres of  
5 sensitive development (i.e. residential development and the  
6 school) and that the impact of noise, dust and vibration and  
7 the impact on amenity to that sensitive development was  
8 unacceptable.

9 The report has looked at the potential impacts of noise,  
10 dust and blasting, it was looked at in detail in the original  
11 report, and is considered again in relation to this issue.  
12 Having considered the noise, dust and blasting position,  
13 officers are of the view that there is no significant adverse  
14 impact on the sensitive development by encroachment within  
15 200 metres. Nevertheless, it has to be accepted that Minerals  
16 Technical Advice Note 1 does say that 200 metres should be the  
17 buffer zone limit and it should only be reduced in clear and  
18 justifiable situations.

19 Now, from an officer point of view, it is difficult to  
20 argue that given the background information on noise, dust and  
21 blasting there would be significant amenity concerns, but it  
22 is for members to decide whether there are clear and  
23 justifiable reasons whether the 200 metres should be rigidly  
24 applied in this case, or whether it should be reduced to what  
25 is proposed by the applicant.

1           So, those are the relative strengths and weaknesses.  
2           The report does also touch on the requirement for Rhondda  
3           Cynon Taf Council to have a steady supply of minerals and the  
4           requirement under Policy CS10 of the local development plan is  
5           that ten years' supply has to be in place at any point.  
6           I think at the moment the supply in RCT is possibly about  
7           12 years, off the top of my head. But in terms of going  
8           forward, and for your next LDP, consideration will need to be  
9           given to what the Regional Technical Statement For Aggregates  
10          in South Wales will say when it comes out later this year and  
11          it is likely to require RCT to provide enough material which  
12          will be greater than the ability of Craig Yr Hesg, Hendy and  
13          Forest Wood to produce. So, there will be additional site  
14          required if this site is found to be unacceptable. Obviously,  
15          that is something for members to be aware of when making the  
16          decision. It has no particular impact on this decision other  
17          than this is the only site identified in the LDP to meet the  
18          requirements and without this site there would have to be an  
19          alternative found.

20                 The recommendation of officers continues to be that the  
21                 application should be approved, subject to the conditions  
22                 attached to the original report, subject to an additional  
23                 condition setting an annual limit of 400,000 tonnes per annum  
24                 for output and a section 106 agreement as indicated in the  
25                 original report.

1           Mr. Jim Bailey did highlight the fact that the reason  
2           for refusal that has been put forward, the recommendation that  
3           has been put forward is that: "Minerals Technical Advice Note  
4           1 on Aggregates paragraphs 70 and 71 identify a suitable  
5           minimum distance between hard rock quarries and sensitive  
6           developments of 200 metres and states that any reduction from  
7           this distance should be evidenced by clear and justifiable  
8           reasons. The proposed quarry extension encroaches within 200  
9           metres of sensitive development and the Council does not  
10          consider that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence  
11          of clear and justifiable reasons for reducing that minimum  
12          distance in this case."

13           That is the reason for refusal put forward should  
14          members not wish to make a decision contrary to officer  
15          advice.

16           It was noted by Mr. Bailey earlier that SLR considered  
17          that reason for refusal can be overcome by the imposition of a  
18          condition which requires them not to work within 200 metres of  
19          sensitive property. Having considered that approach, officers  
20          are not of the view that is a suitable way forward. Because  
21          all the plans and documents submitted with the application  
22          make it clear that the proposal is based on what the applicant  
23          considers to be the logical position of the extent of the  
24          quarry. Were a condition to be imposed reducing that logical  
25          extent, that may be seen in itself to be unreasonable because

1 it does not accord with what the plans and documents that have  
2 been put forward.

3 So, whilst they considered that a condition would  
4 address that reason for refusal, officers' position is that  
5 that is not appropriate in this case. Thank you, Chair.

6 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Towns. Okay. Thank you both  
7 Mr. Bailey and Mr. Towns for that presentation. I will open  
8 the debate, call in Councillor Jarman.

9 COUNCILLOR JARMAN: Thank you, Chair. Can I say at the outset the  
10 only sure way the Council can guarantee this development will  
11 not proceed is by withdrawing its offer to sell it to Hanson's  
12 subject to planning; but that is not something this Committee  
13 can do, because it was an executive decision of the Council  
14 which we were not a party to, but there is food for thought  
15 there I am sure.

16 Chair, it is a while now since we last considered this  
17 application and I have spent some time reviewing all the  
18 documentation that has been deposited by the applicant since  
19 2015.

20 Then earlier this week we were sent a letter on behalf  
21 of Hanson's by SLR which officers have referred to, dated  
22 7th July, just a few days ago. I would like to concentrate my  
23 comments on the recommended reason for refusal relating to the  
24 buffer distance which the officer has just recited, so I will  
25 not repeat it, Chair. I am persuaded by the argument that can

1 be made in defence of that reason for refusal, despite SLR  
2 suggesting in their letter that we can attach the condition  
3 which enshrines the 200 metre buffer must be retained  
4 throughout the site. But unlike the assurance given that  
5 Hansons would not appeal the condition on the average output  
6 of 400,000 tons, no such commitment is given in so far as the  
7 200 metre buffer condition is concerned, which is very  
8 disingenuous, to say the least.

9 Therefore, I am of a mind, Chair, that if a condition is  
10 attached, it is still on the 200 metre buffer zone, then  
11 Hanson will appeal that condition, quoting case law from 1989  
12 or 2000, as they have in their planning policy document that  
13 they submitted in 2015, the case law from 1989 or 2000 as they  
14 did, and also the LDP inspector is quoted in some detail in  
15 those documents.

16 I think despite all that, the fact that they were  
17 prepared to consider a condition attached to the insistence on  
18 a 200 metre buffer zone speaks volumes because it goes against  
19 everything that they submitted in their planning application,  
20 but what it does hint is that they are uncertain that the  
21 Council is not on strong grounds in refusing it for that very  
22 reason. I think that speaks volumes for the arguments put  
23 forward, Chair.

24 We have looked long and hard at this and I must say that  
25 the presumption made by SLR that we come here and we are



1 casual about our decision-making is an insult to this Planning  
2 Committee. I would like to question some of the information  
3 that they are claiming relating to the number of people who  
4 would be employed as a consequence of this.

5 In their planning policy document that they submitted  
6 initially, they said that there would be 16 directly employed  
7 and 30 indirectly, hauliers, making a full-time equivalent of  
8 46 jobs. In the most recent letter received from, was it  
9 Mr. Jenkins, he cites that there would be 135 jobs benefiting  
10 as a consequence of this development. But he does illustrate  
11 it by saying 25 full-time on site, 40 drivers, 20-30  
12 contractor drivers, 40 servicing and maintenance jobs, making  
13 135 jobs. Well, again, I think that is a little disingenuous,  
14 when at the same token he is saying the number of vehicles to  
15 and from the site will be very marginal.

16 I am not persuaded that we need to approve this  
17 application, Chair. I have given reasons why I would support  
18 the recommendation to refuse on the basis of the reasons set  
19 out on page 11 of our report today.

20 I wondered if I could also put on record, whilst I have  
21 been brought up in a dusty environment, I am of a generation  
22 where the extraction industry was at its peak. I do not care  
23 what anybody says about not being able to breathe in the  
24 particulates in relation to this site, it is a very  
25 debilitating experience. If you were living at home

1 surrounded by dust 24/7, that is enough to drive you crazy.  
2 I have lived with it with extraction industries and the  
3 furnace plant in Aberaman. It is debilitating on households.  
4 They might not be able to breathe it in, but they are touching  
5 it every day, and I do not accept that does not have an effect  
6 on health. It has a very significant effect on health.

7 Thank you, Chair.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. Councillor Jarman, can I just ask, you referred  
9 to, you accept in the grounds of refusal. Are you making a  
10 motion?

11 COUNCILLOR JARMAN: I want to hear the rest of the debate, Chair,  
12 at this moment. That is why I said I would like to come in  
13 perhaps after hearing other speakers.

14 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Can I call on Councillor Hughes.

15 COUNCILLOR HUGHES: Thank you very much, Chair. I just wanted to  
16 ask a question in relation to the suggested additional  
17 recommendation of limiting the extraction to 400,000 tonnes  
18 per year, in terms of how would that be monitored and  
19 controlled? If they would not adhere to that 400,000 tonnes  
20 extraction rate per year, how would they then be dealt with  
21 and who would then deal with that? Thank you.

22 THE CHAIR: Mr. Bailey?

23 MR. BAILEY: Thank you, Chair. I am sure Hugh can correct me if  
24 I am wrong. Certainly, in terms of the amount of material  
25 that would be coming out of that quarry, then that has to be

1 recorded. They have a weighbridge facility for vehicles  
2 leaving the quarry. There is, if you like, an ongoing  
3 register record kept which would record the volumes that would  
4 be exported from the quarry. So it is on that basis I think  
5 it is fair to say, Hugh -- and please jump in if I am wrong --  
6 the authority is able to monitor the volumes of material over  
7 a year period.

8 Thank you, Chair.

9 THE CHAIR: Mr. Towns, did you want to come back in there?

10 MR. TOWNS: Yes. As Jim Bailey said, there is a weighbridge on  
11 site. Every load going out would need a weighbridge ticket  
12 associated with it. Now, most quarries these days have a  
13 monitoring regime where officers from local authorities go to  
14 monitor the sites and we are certainly talking to RCT at the  
15 moment about whether we could provide a service to you in  
16 relation to that. But any monitoring visit you would ask to  
17 see the weighbridge tickets. You could verify that then by  
18 looking at the amount of material that has been removed from  
19 the face from one visit to the other, work out the volume of  
20 the material that has been taken from the face and does that  
21 equate to the tonnage at the weighbridge. So, there are  
22 checks and balances that can be applied.

23 If they exceed 400,000 tonnes per annum, the response to  
24 that from the Council would potentially be that they serve a  
25 breach of condition notice identifying that 400,000 tonnes per

1           annum has been breached and if it was breached again it would  
2           result in immediate prosecution in the magistrates court.

3           That would be remedy.

4   THE CHAIR:   Okay, thank you for that.   Councillor Bonetto.

5   COUNCILLOR BONETTO:   My question goes back to the health aspect of  
6           it.   I know we have heard about the air quality and everything  
7           like that.   What I would like to know is, has there been any  
8           evidence submitted to, if cases of COPD and any lung  
9           conditions are at a higher level there than they are in  
10          anywhere else within that neighbourhood.   It is something  
11          I would find interesting to see.   Having lived with mining and  
12          everything like that, I come from the Midlands originally, so,  
13          yes, I know what dust and everything is like, because we were  
14          a big mining community.   So I would like to know on this  
15          basis, if there is any evidence to support that this will have  
16          any effects on people's lives.

17   THE CHAIR:   Okay.   Can I call Gareth in on that one.

18   MR. PURNELL:   As I understand it, the local Health Board and in  
19          conjunction with Public Health Wales has had some regard to  
20          the instance of disease within the local community of  
21          Glyncoch.   There is only a very limited understanding due to  
22          the very small population of Glyncoch, and the relatively  
23          infrequent occurrence of the type of diseases which you may  
24          associate with the particular matter.   So it is not possible  
25          to draw firm conclusions, but as I understand it, they did not

1 find any evidence which would suggest it would require further  
2 investigation into the matter.

3 COUNCILLOR BONETTO: Okay. Interesting.

4 THE CHAIR: Councillor Caple.

5 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: Thank you, Chair. This is no doubt a very  
6 difficult decision. However, what is absolutely clear in my  
7 mind are the contributions made by the objectors, including  
8 local members, who spoke so eloquently at a meeting of  
9 6th February. It is evident that all the mitigations and  
10 monitoring are not reflected in the experience and realities  
11 of those who reside in the community. The realities of  
12 blasting and dust and concerns of a local GP in relation to  
13 health and well-being cannot be discounted. The minimum  
14 buffer zone, and I emphasise minimum, is breached and  
15 compromised from 200 metres down to around 160-170 metres.  
16 Therefore, in conclusion I will be voting to refuse this  
17 application.

18 COUNCILLOR FYCHAN: I would second that, Chair.

19 THE CHAIR: Councillor Caple, are you making a firm motion?

20 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: I will formally move to refuse the application.

21 THE CHAIR: Can you be clear about your grounds, your grounds,  
22 please, Councillor Caple.

23 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: As I mentioned in my speech, the buffer zone in  
24 particular.

25 THE CHAIR: Right. So, you are moving against officers'

1 recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that  
2 it breaches the buffer zone, the required 200 metre buffer  
3 zone?

4 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: Yes.

5 THE CHAIR: Okay. Is that seconded?

6 COUNCILLOR FYCHAN: Yes.

7 COUNCILLOR D WILLIAMS: Yes.

8 THE CHAIR: I have two seconders and I can see who they are on my  
9 screen.

10 COUNCILLOR D WILLIAMS: I second it, Chair, I am Councillor  
11 Williams.

12 THE CHAIR: Okay. So that is fine. Okay.

13 The next speaker is Councillor Owen.

14 COUNCILLOR OWEN: Yes, Chair. During the last meeting when this  
15 came to Committee I was concerned, concerning the Youth Club  
16 and the closeness to the quarry. That is something like  
17 120, between 100 and 120 metres, but the officers do not seem  
18 to look at that as a reason for refusal. At the end of the  
19 day, we, as Councillors, are elected to represent the people  
20 that we actually represent. I will be voting the same way as  
21 I voted last and I will be voting against this application as  
22 well. Big businesses should not be telling us what to do. We  
23 are here to look after the residents and that is what  
24 I believe. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Councillor Owen. Councillor Powderhill?

1 COUNCILLOR POWDERHILL: Thank you, Chair. I am looking at it from  
2 both angles, from the angle of benefits and the retention of  
3 so-called needed reserves. Also, from the detrimental effect  
4 on local lives and lives as put out by the members. I would  
5 have liked to have heard at firsthand what the local elected  
6 member had to say. I really would have. I am going to say it  
7 again, I am genuinely appalled that I could not listen to  
8 that, but I understand the reasons and that is correct.

9 Now, I grew up in a mining village Ynysybwl and  
10 I delivered newspapers. As a young child, listening to old  
11 people who had worked down the pits struggling to get a breath  
12 and I would have throw the newspaper through the bedroom  
13 window, because they could not come down because they were on  
14 oxygen.

15 I understand the dust. Silicosis is quite close to both  
16 pneumonia and, of course, asbestosis. It is a silent killer  
17 and I am pretty sure that we have not seen the results of what  
18 has gone on over the past 25 years. We all know that  
19 asbestos, et cetera, can lay dormant for a long time. I am  
20 pretty sure of this as well, but you have to take it all on  
21 its own merit.

22 The buffer zone is there for a reason. It is there for  
23 a reason or there would not be a buffer zone. I know that  
24 when I used to go on site to photograph these, I would have to  
25 wear a hard hat, I would have to wear the reflective gear, the

1 steel toecaps, and on occasion masks as well.

2 Now, if you are just outside the buffer zone, you do not  
3 have to have any of that, but if you are inside the working  
4 area of the quarry, you have to have all that. That is why  
5 the buffer zone is there. You know, it is there for a reason  
6 otherwise the people on site would not be wearing hats. They  
7 would not need these things. Health and Safety Executive say  
8 they are there for a reason so the public now can have their  
9 buffer zone included and yet that is acceptable.

10 Looking at it on balance, the benefits and the need for  
11 the reserves does not, or should not, ever compromise the  
12 health and safety of the local community. Regarding the  
13 journeys of these 44-tonne vehicles, anybody knows -- I think  
14 the report is quite obvious -- that a 2012 transport report is  
15 outdated. We are in uncertain times at the moment with the  
16 White Bridge gone. All of the traffic goes down Berw Road  
17 now. Everything goes down Berw Road. Just with those  
18 vehicles alone, only one can go through the traffic lights so,  
19 as was intimated earlier, the traffic does back up, and then  
20 they go through in a convoy. For them to get out on to the  
21 main road, once one goes through, they go through in a convoy,  
22 therefore blocking the traffic.

23 So, I do think as well that it is an important reason,  
24 but I agree with what has been said by members. We are there  
25 to make a balanced decision and that is what I am making now



1 -- a balanced decision. I have taken on board what has been  
2 said, the reasons for approving it, I have taken on board the  
3 reasons for refusal, and I think the health and safety  
4 concerns of the buffer zone are sufficient to warrant refusal  
5 so I am going to go for refusal. Thank you, Chair.

6 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Councillor Powderhill. Councillor Grehan.

7 COUNCILLOR GREHAN: Thank you very much.

8 The question I have is regarding these large lorries  
9 that are backwards and forwards along Berw Road, do the  
10 officers think that, maybe, these lorries, their weight, and  
11 the vibrations that are coming from them is affecting the  
12 walls?

13 We know in the floods that many of the walls along Berw  
14 Road collapsed, it's possible that the lorries could have  
15 affected that?

16 Can I just ask the opinion of officers from Porth Road,  
17 maybe Mr Zenali on that?

18 THE CHAIR: Mr. Zeinali?

19 MR. ZEINALI: Thank you, Chair. In terms of HGV movements and the  
20 potential vibration generated by the wheels, certainly in  
21 terms of the obvious impact of any vibration, it would be so  
22 minor that I cannot see that vibration having adverse impact  
23 on the structural integrity of any dwelling in Berw Road,  
24 indeed. Clearly, it is the wear and tear impact of the  
25 lorries on the Berw Road itself which results in maintenance

1 liability for the Council. Hence, the reason why it was being  
2 suggested that the Council, if they can, can monitor that and  
3 establish the cause of damage to the fabric of the highway  
4 caused by excessive lorries and then we can use section 59 of  
5 the Highways Act to compare, obviously, and recoup the money  
6 back from the developer, in this case the quarry.

7 In answering the question, certainly the vibration  
8 generated by the wheels, obviously rubber tyre wheels, would  
9 not be significant to cause damage to the fabric of the  
10 structures that is the houses in Berw Road. Thank you, Chair.

11 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Zeinali. Councillor Jarman, you have  
12 indicated that you wanted to come back in.

13 COUNCILLOR JARMAN: Yes, thank you, Chair. I just wondered, this  
14 SLR, the 7th July one, really is hypercritical of anyone in  
15 Rhondda Cynon Taf, officer or member, in determining this  
16 application and that is regrettable. I wondered, following on  
17 from where I ended last time, regarding the attachment of a  
18 condition, as SLR suggested, officers said that they could not  
19 do that because the body of the application has not got the  
20 flexibility to introduce that.

21 Now, given all that is in the SLR letter, I am wondering  
22 what is in their mind, this late in the day, in suggesting,  
23 "Please do not refuse it, but attach a condition setting out  
24 the imposition of a buffer zone, which could be adopted by  
25 this Committee", where all along the way they have not wanted

1 any of that buffer zone to be realised other than the one that  
2 they have in their application.

3 Now, it does seem a bit rich to me for them to come in  
4 at this late date. On the one instance, they have written a  
5 form of words on the 400,000 tonnes as if our officers would  
6 not be capable of drafting a suitable condition for that. On  
7 top of that, they say, "Please do not refuse this, attach a  
8 condition on the buffer zone."

9 Well, I think the clear message from the report and for  
10 our officers today is that it is a bit late in the day to do  
11 that and it is not doable. That is the crux of the  
12 recommendation in front of us. It is that they have not  
13 persuaded us, as a local planning authority, that -- what are  
14 the words -- "The proposed quarry extension encroaches within  
15 200m of sensitive development and the Council does not  
16 consider that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence  
17 of clear and justifiable reasons for reducing the minimum  
18 distance in this case." That is clear, that is categoric, and  
19 the person who drafted that SLR letter is very well aware of  
20 it. This is a sound recommendation and can be defended on the  
21 basis of SLR weakening their own argument in relation to the  
22 buffer zone.

23 I am very comfortable with supporting the decision to  
24 refuse on the basis of the recommended reason relating to  
25 buffer zone, Chair.

1 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Jarman. Councillor  
2 Williams?

3 COUNCILLOR J WILLIAMS: I wanted to agree with what Councillor  
4 Owen said. We are here to represent residents and that is why  
5 there is this committee, is it not? In the last meeting when  
6 we agreed to refuse this application, the representations were  
7 very powerful, both from Councillor Williams and from members  
8 of the public. The buffer zone is a definite reason for  
9 refusal and I wonder whether we should still, even though we  
10 have been told that the air quality is okay by what Public  
11 Health Wales has got to say and Cwm Taf, I still have concerns  
12 about the health of residents everywhere in the area and  
13 similarly with highway safety. We know the damage that is  
14 going to happen to Berw Road and, you know, I just cannot vote  
15 *(unclear due to audio distortion)*. I will not refuse, but I  
16 do wonder if we can add highway safety and health grounds to  
17 our reasons, even though the buffer zone is *(unclear due to*  
18 *audio distortion)*. Thank you, Chair.

19 THE CHAIR: Well, we have a firm motion before us, Councillor  
20 Williams, which is on the basis of the buffer zone, and  
21 I think really what we have heard from officers is that the  
22 buffer zone is one that they are clearly in breach of and in  
23 terms of any condition attached, we are charged with looking  
24 at the plan that they themselves have put before us, and that  
25 plan breaches the buffer zone. So, it is not for us to tell

1           them how to put a plan in. So, we have a clear motion from  
2           Councillor Caple that we refuse the application against  
3           officers' recommendations ----

4   COUNCILLOR J WILLIAMS: I just wonder whether we can strengthen  
5           it, Chair. I am not disputing anything against the motion,  
6           Councillor Caple. We are often told about the (*unclear due to*  
7           *audio distortion*) I would be happy to stay where we are.  
8           I just wondered.

9   THE CHAIR: I call Mr. Bailey in.

10   MR. BAILEY: Thank you, Chair. I think what we have tried to do  
11           in the report back before you this afternoon is give you a  
12           very fair and objective report in terms of what we feel the  
13           relative strengths and weaknesses are for those three concerns  
14           expressed at the last meeting. I think, for the reasons that  
15           Hugh very clearly set out, in terms of all the evidence, in  
16           terms of air quality and the health impacts, it would be very  
17           difficult indeed for us to come up with any substantive  
18           argument to support that reason, if it was a reason you wanted  
19           to go with.

20           The same is true, again for the reasons set out, in  
21           terms of highways. However, in terms of the fact that the  
22           proposal does incur within, and it does suggest a minimum of a  
23           200 metre buffer zone within the mineral TAN, that is a matter  
24           of fact.

25           The fact that the officers have perhaps suggested within

1 the report that they feel that the measures of mitigation that  
2 Hansons have put forward within their application is  
3 sufficient to mitigate those impacts, as both Hugh and Simon  
4 set out at the very start of the meeting, members are quite  
5 entitled to take a contrary view. If you do not feel, which  
6 discussion would tend to suggest is the case, that you do  
7 not feel that they have evidenced the reasons for incurring  
8 into that 200 metres, then I would strongly suggest to you  
9 that that would be the reason that you would put forward and  
10 not advance the other two reasons, which I feel would be far  
11 more difficult to evidence. Thank you, Chair.

12 THE CHAIR: Okay. There are two hands up. Councillor Hughes?

13 COUNCILLOR HUGHES: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I was just going to  
14 say that I think in a recent meeting, we were advised that  
15 actually, in circumstances like this, to not throw reasons at  
16 it, but to use relevant reasons. For me, looking at the  
17 evidence, there are health issues and the transportation  
18 issues can be mitigated against. However, the 200 metres is  
19 quite clear. There is not a 200 metre buffer and I would be  
20 uncomfortable adding the other reasons in. I would want to  
21 keep it specifically to the 200 metres, personally. Thank  
22 you.

23 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Councillor Jarman?

24 COUNCILLOR JARMAN: Thank you, Chair. Can I just pick up on the  
25 closing remarks of Mr. Bailey and read to you from the SLR

1 letter what they said about attaching a condition relating to  
2 the buffer zone: "We strongly and respectfully suggest that  
3 in the context of the recommendation to approve, the Committee  
4 does not need to refuse the application for the suggested  
5 reason and the alternative and appropriate approach of  
6 granting the application with a suitably-worded condition  
7 regarding the imposition of a buffer zone should be adopted by  
8 the Committee."

9 They are worried about that condition that a refusal  
10 would be attached with and I think that they have come in with  
11 that. If we did attach a condition relating to the buffer  
12 zone, I have no doubt they would come in and they would appeal  
13 that condition, if nothing else, but I think that they know  
14 that we have very strong grounds for defending the  
15 recommendation, the suggested recommendation, which is likely  
16 members will support, because they let a cat out of the bag by  
17 those remarks, the closing remarks in the letter of SLR.

18 Thank you, Chair.

19 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Councillor Jarman. No other members have  
20 indicated they wish to speak so we have had a motion and that  
21 has been seconded. So, we have had a motion to refuse the  
22 application to extend the quarry at Craig Yr Hesg quarry, Berw  
23 Road, Pontypridd against officers' recommendations. I will  
24 take a vote on that now. I will take a roll call vote on  
25 that. Councillor Bonetto?

1 COUNCILLOR BONETTO: Refusal of the application.

2 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Councillor Caple, you moved refusal so I  
3 am taking that you will ----

4 COUNCILLOR CAPLE: Refused, Chair.

5 THE CHAIR: Councillor Grehan?

6 COUNCILLOR GREHAN: In support of the proposal to refuse the  
7 application.

8 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Councillor Hughes, you seconded.

9 COUNCILLOR HUGHES: Yes.

10 THE CHAIR: Councillor Jarman?

11 COUNCILLOR JARMAN: Refuse the application.

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Councillor Owen?

13 COUNCILLOR OWEN: Refuse the application.

14 THE CHAIR: Councillor Powderhill?

15 COUNCILLOR POWDERHILL: I have indicated I support the refusal  
16 against the officers' recommendation, Chair.

17 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Councillor Williams?

18 COUNCILLOR WILLIAMS: Refused, Chair.

19 THE CHAIR: And Councillor Yeo?

20 COUNCILLOR YEO: Refused, Chair, against the officers'  
21 recommendation.

22 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Humphreys, could you sum up the  
23 decision of the Committee, please?

24 MR. HUMPHREYS: Thank you, Chair. The Committee were unanimous in  
25 the decision to refuse the application on the grounds set out



1 in the report, that the "Minerals Technical Advice Note MTAN1,  
2 Aggregates, identifies a suitable minimum distance between  
3 hard rock quarries and sensitive development as 200 metres and  
4 states that any reduction from this distance should be  
5 evidenced by clear and justifiable reasons. The proposed  
6 quarry extension encroaches within 200 metres of sensitive  
7 development and the Council does not consider that the  
8 applicant has provided sufficient evidence of clear and  
9 justifiable reasons for reducing the minimum distance in this  
10 case." Thank you, Chair.

11 THE CHAIR: Thank you for that, Mr. Humphreys. The final item on  
12 today's agenda is any other urgent business. We have not had  
13 any so that conclude the meeting for today. We do have  
14 another meeting next week, a week today, with quite a lengthy  
15 agenda, I think, so we will see you next week. Thank you  
16 everyone. Thank you, Mr. Towns, for joining us. Thank you to  
17 all the members.

18 - - - - -  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25