

Bonsall Parish Council
Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at
Bonsall Village Hall

Chair of the Council: Cllr Mark Harris

Clerk: Tony Payne 27 High St Bonsall DE4 2AS; telephone: 07306 311451; email: bonsallclerk@gmail.com

Minute No	Item	Action
18/1/1	Present: Cllrs Addis Barry Grover Harris and J. Smith and Taylor, District Cllr Purdy and District and County Cllr Murphy Mr T Payne (Clerk/RFO). Two members of the public.	
18/1/2	Apologies for Absence: Cllr S. Smith; K. Potter Peak Park Forum.	
18/1/3	Variation to the Order of Business: none.	Clerk
18/1/4	Declaration of Interests: Cllr Grover declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 18/1/11 (c) (Slinter Top Quarry) on the basis that noise levels he had experienced meant that he had an interest in the issue as a resident as well as a Councillor, but that he was able to speak and vote on the issue in order to represent the views of residents that had been passed on to him.	
18/1/5	Casual Vacancy: noted that no applications had been received to date.	
18/1/6	<p>Public Speaking:</p> <p>Slinter Quarry planning applications: Cllr Murphy reported that the County Council were reviewing the recently submitted environmental statement information and may seek expert advice on that in the light of new legislation. The application to extend the current planning permission would need to go through the same process. Cllr Grover commented that this extension process could take many years given previous experience, and that in the meantime the problems reported by residents would continue. Cllr Purdy said the head of DCC Planning was fully aware of the process and what was needed, and that it would not necessarily be that long [see further item 18/1/11 (c)].</p> <p>Via Gellia Improvement works: Cllr Murphy said that it was hoped that an outline scheme would be available for consultation in a few months time; he understood that approximately £3.5 million of Department of Transport funding was available.</p> <p>Motocross track: Cllr Purdy said that the situation was still unchanged in that he was unable to report details of the District Council's involvement on lead issues, but that noise monitoring was continuing. Cllr Barry also reported serious noise issues with the track experienced in Uppertown the weekend on 16th January [see further item 18/1/9 (f)].</p> <p>Refuse collection: Cllr Purdy said that problems were still occurring due to staff covid absences. Missed bins for individual households should be reported via the Council website Missed collections - Derbyshire Dales District Council; if a whole street was missed then residents could report by email to waste@derbyshiredales.gov.uk. The independent review into the waste management contract should be finalised and published in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Ward Boundary review for Bonsall: Cllr Purdy said that the Final Recommendations of the Boundary Commission, which again recommended a new Bonsall and Winster ward, had 'come out of the blue' and that so far as he knew it was not supported by any group on the District Council. He also expressed concern that submissions that had been made to the Commission were not recorded in the final report [see further item 18/1/9 (a)].</p> <p>Highway weed clearing / spraying: a resident referred to his comments submitted to the 19th October meeting of the Council, and again expressed his concern at the potential long term damage which could be caused by self-setting trees in the highway verge and walls. He asked for an update from the Parish Council on what was being done. The Chair said that he and the resident had walked the village and identified problem areas, and that the Council would advise the County or District Council (and Cllr Purdy) of any issues that required their attention. Cllr Grover asked whether there had been any change in District Council policy on use of weed-spraying; Cllr Purdy said that glyphosate was still used under very controlled conditions and that he understood that a new product was being tested. In response to a point made by Cllr Taylor about gullies becoming blocked, Cllr Purdy said that gully sweeping is not as efficient as it should be due to the financial austerity measures that the Council had</p>	

Bonsall Parish Council

**Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at
Bonsall Village Hall**

	<p>faced, but that the programme was being reviewed to see if frequency could be increased.</p> <p>Bankside: Cllr Addis asked about progress on the works to the highway that the County Council had identified as needed due to HGV damage caused on 30th September 2021; Cllr Murphy said that he would make enquiries and report back</p> <p>Quiet Lanes and Home Zones: Cllr Murphy said that he would also check any County Council policy on Home Zones.</p>	<p>Cllr Murphy</p> <p>Cllr Murphy</p>
18/1/7	Minutes of the last meeting: The Chair signed the minutes of the meeting held on 21 st December 2021.	
18/1/8	Chair's Announcements: the Chair said that he was sorry to report that Tony Payne the Clerk and RFO had given notice to 31 st March 2022. Arrangements were being put in place for recruitment [see further item 18/1/9 (h)].	

18/1/9	<p>VILLAGE MATTERS.</p> <p>a) Local Government Boundary Commission:</p> <p>The Clerk reported that the Boundary Commission had now made their final recommendations into the arrangements for new ward boundaries for the Derbyshire Dales district. The final recommendation for Bonsall was for a single District Councillor to represent a new ward of Bonsall and Winster. That proposal had been previously put forward by the Commission in early 2021, and had been heavily opposed then in submissions from Bonsall residents and the Parish Council. As a result, the Commission had reinstated a Masson ward comprising Bonsall Cromford and Middleton by Wirksworth, but then reversed that decision in their final recommendations. Comments from residents objecting to these final proposals were reported.</p> <p>After discussion, it was agreed that the Council should write to Sarah Dines MP, to the Boundary Commission, and to Derbyshire Dales District Council objecting to the final recommendations that had been made as they relate to Bonsall and Winster ward on the following grounds:</p> <p>“In February 2021 the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) published its draft recommendations for revised electoral boundaries in Derbyshire Dales. Part of this proposal was to change the existing Masson Ward, which includes Bonsall, Cromford and Matlock Bath, and to place Bonsall into a new ward called “<i>Bonsall & Winster</i>”.</p> <p>The draft recommendations of February 2021 explained that an electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority, and these arrangements decide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · How many councillors are needed. · How many wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries should be and what they should be called. · How many councillors should represent each ward or division. <p>The objectives of the Boundary Commission were stated to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents. · Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity. · Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government. <p>In several places the draft recommendations referred to submissions requesting that wards should not consist of a mix of areas which lie within the National Park and parishes which lie outside the National Park, because of differences in the character of the settlements and differences in planning processes. Bonsall Parish Council agree with this proposal, and consider it is essential in order to achieve the third statutory requirement governing this</p>	
--------	--	--

Bonsall Parish Council

Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at Bonsall Village Hall

electoral review –providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

The recommendations grouped Bonsall and Winster into a new ward, called “*Bonsall & Winster*”. This removed the large village of Bonsall from Masson Ward, within which we share a strong community identity with Cromford and Matlock Bath, and placed Bonsall into a ward with Winster, which lies a considerable distance from Bonsall, which provides no amenities which are commonly used by Bonsall electors, with which there is no obvious community identity, and which lies within the National Park.

The second draft recommendations of the Boundary Commission accepted the arguments submitted during public consultation for maintaining the link between Cromford and Bonsall, whilst adding in Middleton by Wirksworth. However, the final report which has just been published still has Bonsall grouped with Winster in a new ward, as originally proposed. The justification offered for this is that it is related to a desire to group Middleton by Wirksworth and Wirksworth, but there is no logical relationship between this measure and the need to reflect community identity for Bonsall. Furthermore, moving Bonsall into a ward that is primarily within the National Park is contrary to the statutory requirement of “Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government”, as indicated by several submissions listed in the Recommendations of 2021.

We would expand on this as follows:

Community identity: the communities of Bonsall and Cromford have a shared history based on employment and life around the mills and quarries in and surrounding the Derwent Valley. Those common issues still endure today, and involve current ward Councillors working on shared problems.

Quarrying: a principal one is quarrying, carried out in both parishes (but not in Winster). A Quarry Liaison group which addresses some of the environmental issues arising from that is attended by Bonsall and Cromford Parish Councillors, and District Councillors. Bonsall and Cromford Parish Councils share agendas and minutes.

Transport links are a key common concern. These settlements are still one community and share arterial roads for access (A6, B5036 and A5012). Cromford and Bonsall are closely linked by the A5012 (Via Gellia) and share common problems associated with this road, including heavy traffic, comprising a high proportion of trucks and serious disruption to life and commerce when the road is closed for repairs. This road is the main access route to Bonsall and it creates a short and strong link between the two settlements.

There are also **close commercial employment and social** ties. Bonsall people tend to use Cromford for the Post Office, hair dressers, convenience stores, news agent and fast food or casual dining. Many people have friends in either village and there are families that lie partly in each village. Many Cromford families have used St James Church Bonsall for burials. The gap between the last house in Cromford and the Pig of Lead (first houses in Bonsall) is less than one kilometre. These are close and intimate communities. The same is not true of Bonsall village and Winster, which are separated by over 3 miles of moorland.

Cromford and Bonsall villages are very closely allied as a community with common identity and interests. Both villages lie outside the National Park. Communities within the Park should not be grouped with communities outside the park, and the converse is true.

National Park: Bonsall parish has a population of 803 residents (2011 census). The great majority of that population (estimated at around 90/95%) live outside of the National Park boundary. Within Bonsall parish there are estimated to be fewer than 20 houses that lie within the National Park from a total of 345 households in the Parish. The rest of Bonsall settlement lies outside the Park.

The review does not indicate that there has been any change in the three statutory criteria since the setting of the current electoral boundaries. Cromford, Bonsall and Matlock Bath parishes are within Masson ward, so clearly this was considered to reflect community identities and associations within the area. Nothing has changed that can justify severing our community or that alters the best way of providing effective and convenient local government to the electors of Bonsall village, in particular in relation to the issue of the National Park,

Bonsall Parish Council

Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at Bonsall Village Hall

where the new arrangement creates a ward with effectively two communities (Bonsall and Winster) operating under separate systems of local governance.

Public consultation: the Parish Council objected to the original proposal to link Winster and Bonsall, and submitted that objection to the Boundary Commission. Many other residents made similar points (there were 58 submissions objecting to those initial arrangements; all submissions by Bonsall residents favoured retaining the village in a ward with Cromford). The Boundary Commission acknowledged this in their second draft recommendations which restored the Cromford/Bonsall link:

58. Several submissions were also strongly opposed to Bonsall parish being separated from the parishes of Cromford and Matlock Bath. These were on the basis that the three share many local amenities and have a similar character, while Bonsall had little relationship to and limited transport links with Winster parish or any of the other parishes grouped into our draft Bonsall & Winster ward. This presented a significant challenge. While Cromford and Matlock Bath could be grouped together in a single-councillor ward with a 0% electoral variance, as in the multi-party scheme, the addition of Bonsall as per the existing Masson ward would create an electoral variance of 37% for a single-councillor ward or -28% for a two-councillor ward.

59 Two residents, when listing parishes which would be better suited to Bonsall than Winster, suggested Middleton as well as Cromford and Matlock Bath. We decided to adopt this suggestion after careful consideration as, with the addition of Ible and Ivonbrook Grange parishes, it was possible to create a two-councillor ward with an electoral variance of -10%.

In the Final Recommendations (paragraphs 48 and 49) the Commission simply states:

Bonsall & Winster and Cromford & Matlock Bath

48 We received 34 submissions in response to our new draft recommendations for Masson ward, all of which were against the inclusion of Middleton by Wirksworth parish, and in favour of it remaining in a ward with Wirksworth parish. This view was also expressed in the Liberal Democrat submission. While we had not received any submission regarding Middleton by Wirksworth at any previous stage of the review, these submissions made clear the parish's complete reliance on Wirksworth for its services and amenities and the close community ties between the two.

49 It should be noted that, in response to previous submissions from residents, we had sought to include Bonsall parish in a Masson ward with Cromford and Matlock Bath parishes in our new draft recommendations. Having carefully considered the evidence received at all stages of this review, we note that, to ensure good electoral equality, we cannot recommend both of these approaches. In light of this we have now concluded that separating Middleton by Wirksworth from Wirksworth will not provide the best balance of our statutory criteria, and have instead adopted the Liberal Democrat scheme in our final recommendations.

There is no acknowledgement of the previous submissions which strongly opposed these arrangements, or attempt to rationalise any community linkage between the settlements in the new ward, or to address the issue that the greater part of the Bonsall Parish lies outside of the Peak District National Park, and how this is compatible with the provision of arrangements that support effective and convenient local government. Indeed, no justification is given in the final proposals for placing Bonsall and Winster in the same ward.

Numbers of Councillors: Bonsall Parish Council acknowledges the strength of the argument that has been made by others that the process adopted by the Boundary Commission was flawed, in that the reduction in number of Councillors (from 39 to 34) for the District as a whole was settled before the process of consultation began, and that this may have led to the decisions that the Commission has now reached. However, whether or not that argument is accepted, the Council is primarily concerned at the lack of justification for those decisions and their incompatibility with the stated objectives of the review.

Summary: the proposed Bonsall and Winster ward is in breach of the two most important

Bonsall Parish Council

**Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at
Bonsall Village Hall**

	<p>principles that are supposed to guide the work of the Commission; reflecting community identity and effective local government. Therefore, Bonsall Parish Council request you as our Member of Parliament to make strenuous representations on behalf of the electors of Bonsall to have the new boundaries overturned, and to maintain either the existing Masson Ward or to retain all the existing wards in DDCC until such time that revised wards and the required number of councillors can be resolved in a manner which does comply with the electoral laws and the objectives of the review”.</p> <p>b) Park and Vehicle Park: Cllr Grover reported that the charge collection box had been welded. It was noted that further items belonging to the carnival committee would be moved to the container unit from the Barn on High Street once stock to be kept had been sorted. Cllrs Harris and Barry were to check the unit with a view to fitting racking to maximise space and report back. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>c) DDDC Local Projects Fund and DCC Community Leaders Fund: it was agreed to submit grant applications to cover the costs of the Welcome Packs, materials for Planter boxes, car park signage and the vehicle park collection box pillar.</p> <p>d) Website management: the Clerk reported that the website working group on 10th January 2022 had discussed arrangements for Niamh’s Photography Lens to undertake temporary hosting of the current website and to work to transfer domain name and set up the new site. A monthly fee of £25 was now being paid. Cllr Taylor said that compliance with new Accessibility legislation meant that longer term a mainstream hosting company should be used. Noted that long-term arrangements would be considered once the current transfer work was completed.</p> <p>e) Village Welcome pack: an updated version of the pack was displayed. The content of the pack was agreed in principle and the layout and printing would be considered at the next meeting.</p> <p>f) Motocross site former White Low mine: a complaint from a resident about noise on 16th January was reported; the District Council Environmental Health team were to be involved. The Clerk reported on a telephone call from the owner of the track on 24th December to update the Council on issues relating to the track. Key points that the owner had made were (a) that he had commissioned a lead contamination report (98 pages) which he said demonstrated that the track was safe to use, and that this had been passed to the District Council; (b) in relation to the forthcoming planning enquiry he was confident of success, and that he wanted to manage future use of the track after the enquiry on a ‘moderate basis’ – not 7 days a week; (c) post – enquiry he wanted to work with the Parish Council and the PDNPA to run it in a ‘proper and reasonable way’, and that the Council should contact him to discuss any issues. (d) once the track planning issue was resolved he intended to use current legislation to operate a campsite. Noted.</p> <p>g) Flood Risk Management Plans Consultation: after discussion it was agreed to make no comment on the Management Plans as they did not have any direct impact on local issues.</p> <p>h) Staffing issues: the Chair reported on arrangements for recruitment, and it was agreed (a) to request DALC to undertake a review of post and grading at a cost of c. £130; (b) to set up a recruitment working group comprising Cllrs Addis Grover Harris J. Smith and the Clerk.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Cllrs Barry and Harris</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Taylor</p> <p>Cllrs Addis/Harris/S, Smith Clerk</p>
18/1/10	<p>Finance:</p> <p>a) Monthly Payments received: £495.00 DCC footpath claim 2021-22; £1508.82 DDDC churchyard maintenance claim 2021-22; £200 Jepsons interment fee re the late J. Taylor; £150 balance of EROB fee re Mr and Mrs W Gould.</p> <p>b) Statement/ Annual Accounts: the statement for period 9 detailing income and expenditure to 31 December 2021 was approved.</p> <p>c) Audit: the Clerk recommended a monthly random audit of expenditure items (a similar system had operated in the past). Agreed; and noted with thanks that Cllr</p>	

Bonsall Parish Council

**Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at
Bonsall Village Hall**

	Taylor would undertake this.				Cllr Taylor/
	Online	A Payne	£448.24	Salary/expenses	Clerk
	Online	P Spencer	£106.07	Salary/expenses	
	Online	HMRC	£198.27	PAYE month 10	
	Online	R Allsopp	£100.00	WC cleaning	
	Card	Amazon	£13.00	Container unit lock	
	Card	FloodSax Direct	£288.00	Flood sacks	
	DD	Niamh's Photographic Lens	£25.00	Monthly website hosting fee	
	DD	Virgin Mobile	£22.00	Phone charges	
	DD	Zoom	£14.39	Meeting hosting fee	
	DD	E.ON (The Park)	£12.79	Electricity	
	DD	E.ON (The Cross)	£24.60	Electricity	
18/1/11	<p align="center">Planning</p> <p>(a) SCOM/3/79 Dene Quarry, The Hill, Cromford; Tarmac (Cement & Lime): Scoping opinion request in support of a first periodic review of planning consent CM3/1202/108 dated 18 March 2005; and (b) EM3/1221/46 Dene Quarry, The Hill, Cromford; Tarmac (Cement & Lime): in relation to these applications the Clerk reported that a resident had requested that in view of previous noise issues all future operations should be reviewed in regard to noise in Bonsall. After discussion it was agreed to submit the following comments in respect of both applications (a) and (b) relating to Dene Quarry:</p> <p>“Historically we do not believe that there have not been any major issues in Bonsall attributed to Dene Quarry, however in the last few years there have been noise complaints which DCC have associated with Dene Quarry.</p> <p>The officers planning report in November 2020 for the Slinter quarry extension highlighted nine complaints received in early 2020 which were attributed to the breaking of rock at Dene Quarry. There have also been some more recent complaints which have been attributed to Dene. Dene quarry is behind Slinter, higher up and further away from Bonsall, but still in direct line. It is believed that 2020 incident was an exception caused by newly mobile crushing plant but it does demonstrate how unwarranted noise can travel from Dene to Bonsall</p> <p>Since permission was given to Dene working practices have changed, different plant is used and there are different patterns of noise. Use of a mobile crusher could be problematic if used at the top of the quarry and in line with Bonsall. This needs evaluation as it is a change.</p> <p>It has been pointed out to DCC that bunds are not always a solution to sound and at the 15th September 2021 Quarry Liaison Meeting Slinter mining reported that their bund height increased by several feet to help noise suppression but that unfortunately the act of raising had resulted in noise complaints.</p> <p>It should be noted that official statistics show that for 70% of the time over the last 8 years, wind in this area is from the Southwest quarter i.e. from the quarry towards Bonsall.</p> <p>Slinter quarry have acknowledged that some of their plant produced unacceptable noise and as such changed to more silent plant, we would expect the same from Dene should it be necessary.</p> <p>The following legislative aspects should be considered in any review.</p> <p>From the debate on unwarranted noise in Bonsall from Slinter Quarry the national noise limits of 55dB or 10dB above background have been shown to be outdated and superseded by more recent legislation. National Limits may be relevant to blasting but do not take account of tonal, repetitive or disruptive noise and as such other guidance and legislation must be considered in any review.</p> <p>Planning Policy MP3 permits mineral development “<i>provided that any adverse effects on the environment, including noise, can be eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level</i>”</p>				

Bonsall Parish Council

Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at

Bonsall Village Hall

	<p><i>“The The Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) sets out the Government’s policy on noise and includes the long-term vision of promoting good health and a good quality of life through the effective management of noise within the context of Government policy on sustainable development. The long-term vision is supported by the following aims:</i></p> <p><i>Through the effective management and control of environmental, neighbour and neighbourhood noise within the context of Government policy on sustainable development:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life;• mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; and• where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.” <p>Government guidance on Mineral Planning advises that “<i>where site noise has a significant tonal element it may be appropriate to set specific limits to control this aspect</i>”</p> <p>Bonsall has a Conservation Area and peace and quiet is a key aspect of its designation. Any new noise or changes should take into account Bonsall’s conservation area and residents who enjoy peace and quiet as part of their working and residential lives. The Parish Council would also ask that dust issues are addressed as part of this process.</p> <p>The Parish Council would expect that if this review identifies any change to working practices, quarrying area, levels or method which may have any effect on Bonsall then Dene Quarry should actively engage with Bonsall residents to explain the changes and take on board any concerns. We would also expect DCC to engage with Bonsall Parish Council and residents throughout this review”.</p> <p>(c) CM3/0817/40 Slinter Top Quarry, Cromford; Slinter Mining: Development of a lateral extension to the south west of the existing permitted operations to provide the winning and working of minerals, associated ancillary operations and amended restoration scheme through landfill at Slinter Top Quarry:</p> <p>The Clerk reported comments from a resident expressing concerns about increase of noise from working at a higher elevation; extension of the site is into an area of “unimproved grassland” which required conservation; the impact and lack of viability of the Biodiversity Gain Assessment and plan proposing habitat conservation at Rose Meadows; and the apparent variance between DCC and the applicant company in relation to vein materials extracted from the site. Another resident had expressed objections as to the extension of workings even though planning permission has expired and the proposal to transplant unimproved grasslands and trees etc. (said to have been opposed by Natural England in relation to HS2). Comments of a third resident had been circulated and after discussion it was agreed that these would be best considered in relation to likely future applications.</p> <p>After discussion it was agreed to submit the following comments in relation to the planning application:</p> <p>“Bonsall Parish has received representations from residents and would comment as follows:</p> <p>1. Methodology for Biodiversity Gain Assessment and calculations It appears that the method is not prescribed as it is relatively new and is therefore subjective. We would urge DCC to obtain their own professional opinions on this matter. Slinter’s Consultants method may suit their objective but it clearly goes against the outcomes and expectations of both Natural England’s supporters, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust and Bonsall residents who support preservation of the local ecology.</p> <p>2. Practical aspects of dealing with the issue of the loss of Biodiversity The habitats and ecology in question comprise largely of unimproved grasslands/lowland meadow which DWT in their letter of the 3rd August 2021 describe as a “Habitat of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006) and arguably irreplaceable. <i>Any loss is termed unacceptable within the metric and no proposal resulting in the net destruction of this habitat can truly result in a net gain, even if a compensation package is delivered</i>”. Without repeating DWT’s further arguments, DWT are succinctly of the opinion that Planning Permission should be refused unless there are “<i>wholly exceptional reasons</i>”. A number of Bonsall residents continue to argue that the quarry is primarily a building limestone quarry and support DWT’s views and</p>	Clerk
--	--	-------

Bonsall Parish Council

**Minutes of the Bonsall Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm at
Bonsall Village Hall**

	<p>arguments as to the importance of these unique and irreplaceable habitats. Natural England publish a blog where experts can give their views and opinions on net biodiversity gain - Professor Ian Rotherham and Max Heaver, both qualified experts in this field have given their opinions as follows https://naturalengland.blog.gov.uk/2021/09/21/biodiversity-net-gain-more-than-just-a-number/</p> <p>Professor Ian Rotherham posted on 21 September 2021: <i>“A big problem is the idea that catastrophic losses can be offset - which often they cannot. Whilst there are great opportunities to get developers and business to reinvest in biodiversity this should not be an excuse for irreparable damage. Landscape heritage is also not replaceable or capable of being ‘offset’ - so ancient woods, ancient hedges, veteran trees, traditional unimproved grasslands etc cannot be compensated for. The other real worry with this is the incentive for consultants to offer (for a good-sized fee) offset solutions which are essentially pie-in-the-sky and incapable of realistic delivery and not transparent in terms of their long-term outcomes. This appeals to developers, to politicians, and to planning inspectors since it justifies damaging developments but with a clear conscience - greenwash. We need to engage business and others in genuine commitment to sustainable ecological and heritage solutions. Finally, losses at a particular locale cannot be genuinely offset by actions displaced to another site - ecological systems & local communities simply do not operate in that way. We require more genuinely visionary and pragmatic solutions”.</i></p> <p>Max Heaver posted on 22 September 2021 <i>“A net gain in biodiversity cannot be achieved on areas of development which result in the loss of irreplaceable habitat, such as ancient woodland.....”</i></p> <p>A number of Bonsall residents have voiced their opinion that these important unimproved grasslands cannot be relocated and these views are supported by experts such as Professor Ian Rotherham and Max Heaver.</p> <p>3. Additional information with regard to Mineral Vein Material Working</p> <p>When the previous DCC Planning Officers report was produced in Nov 2020, there were a number of objections based on the premise that no proper attempt had been made, or any professional reports prepared, to identify any further reserves of minerals. It is noted that despite further opportunity, this position has not changed.</p> <p>On page 3 of Stephenson Halliday’s letter dated 1st December it has been stated that 2,935 tonnes of vein material were raised in 2019. There is no documented evidence of this figure in the previous submissions from Slinter prior to the Officers report in December 2020 which stated that <i>“Slinter Top have historically produced around 250 tonnes per year”.</i></p> <p>It is also stated that Slinter Top Quarry has produced an average of 1,863 Tonnes of Vein material between 1979 and 2021. Presumably this production is historic as these figures differ considerably from the recent figures ascertained by DCC in their Mineral Assessment and Plan.</p> <p>Bonsall residents previously raised a number of questions as to both the assessment of future minerals and historic production. These new unsubstantiated figures do not add any further clarity but raise further questions. As there are so many questions regarding quantity and type of minerals which have not been resolved, both Bonsall Parish Council and residents are requesting that an independent expert opinion be commissioned.</p> <p>4. Working practices at Slinter Top Quarry</p> <p>On page 7 there are references to concessions towards Bonsall residents reported at a Quarry Liaison Meeting in February 2018. We have checked the records and there was no Quarry Liaison meeting in February 2018. We would request that this statement is amended”.</p>	Clerk
18/1/12	Items for Information: DALC Circular 16-2021	
18/1/13	Next Parish Council meeting: Tuesday 15th February 2022 at 7.30pm.	

Signed