

Inspector's Agenda and Supplementary Questions: Issue 2

Agenda

- 1 Opening remarks
- 2 Understanding the non-inert landfill capacity gap
- 3 The contribution that might be made from Goldmire Quarry
- 4 Deliverability issues at Goldmire Quarry
- 5 The availability of alternative sites

Having read the further submissions, the following questions need to be addressed by the Council, and others as appropriate, **at the Hearing session. Unless specifically requested by the Inspector via the Programme Officer, no further written statements should be supplied in response and any that are will be returned by the Programme Officer.**

Holker Estates clearly support the inclusion of site BA10 Goldmire Quarry in policy 5 of the Plan. As such they would not normally participate in the hearing session. However, they do so at my invitation given that the principal 'soundness' issue raised by Barrow BC relates to the deliverability of the site.

Agenda Item 2

1. I find paragraphs 5 to 14 of ED87 confusing, particularly with respect to Lillyhall. My understanding is that the additional capacity provided for by policy 5 at this site would be achieved by extending the life of the current permission to acknowledge the remaining void capacity. However, a significant proportion of this void (40%?) could be taken by (V)LLW if the necessary planning application was ultimately approved. If this is right, does this not mean that additional non-inert landfill capacity has to be identified either at this site or elsewhere? *(Note: this has implications for the discussion of Issue 3).* Or could this all be accommodated at Hespin Wood? Could the Council please explain perhaps by way of a simple Table, to be made available on the day, how much non-inert void space they consider to be available during the Plan period at each of the sites referred to?
2. How does any of this impact upon the Core Strategy priority to make additional provision available in the south of the County (CSD14 paragraph 7.31)?

Agenda Item 3

1. Barrow BC appears to overstate the shortfall by about 500,000 cubic metres (ED100, page1). Is this the understanding of other participants?
2. Are Holker Estates able to say what the likely non-inert capacity contribution from Goldmire Quarry will be during the Plan period?

Agenda Item 4

1. From paragraphs 27 to 29 of ED87 it would appear that the Council has no further information about this. I dealt with this at paragraphs 64 and 65 of my report (RSAP10). Have Holker Estates sought the views of the Environment Agency since then?
2. Is there any other evidence available regarding the deliverability of the site and particularly the two issues identified by the Council in the policy?

Agenda Item 5

1. My previous conclusion regarding the inclusion of this site in the Plan is set out in paragraphs 66 and 67 of my report (RSAP10). In summary, I balanced the need for consistency with the Core Strategy against the reservations expressed by the Council and others and expressed again now by Barrow BC. We will have already discussed the need for a site in the south of the County. As there is no evidence of an alternative site or treatment method coming forward, what would be the justification for me taking a different view now on the balance to be struck?