

**ED10**

**Statement on Matter 1: Vision and Objectives on Cumbria County Council's Minerals and Waste management Plan by F B Thompson**

**The identified Vision and Objectives are not the most appropriate for the Plan area**

A

7. There is not a clear relationship between the Spatial Vision and the pattern of proposed development and existing facilities.

The MWLP originally identified (Summary of the Site Allocations Policies - April 2010) for two sites in the Stainton/Newbiggin area as preferred waste treatment facilities under First Preference Sites namely ED 31 Flusco waste management site, near Penrith and under First Preference but reserve sites :- ED 1 Blencowe Quarry, near Penrith.

Subsequently ED 31 Flusco waste management site was modified to include the quarrying of the green field site Silver Field. One gathers from the text that the main reason for this addition was not for minerals but largely to create a void for the waste operation. Similarly ED 1 Blencowe Quarry is modified from a waste management site to an area of minerals search . Subsequently the site was withdrawn as part of the quarry had been developed as a caravan site. This surely means that another quarry site is needed in the locality yet the plan has no second reserves to meet this contingency. This patchwork approach is shown in Figure1 below.

**Figure1**



It fails by totally discounting ED5 on spurious grounds that the site originally identified by the council is partly in the National Park. It is for the National Park Authority to decide on this area not Cumbria County Council and not taking into account impacts on local communities especially traffic, currently of major concern at Newbiggin.

**The soundness criterion the plan fails to address is that of objectivity.**

The Plan can be made sound by revising its projects of demand and revising its assessments of all sites in an objective way..

The precise modification requires a total review of all mineral types it currently focuses mainly on waste and bulk aggregates.

**B**

8. The Plan contain a separate overall Spatial Strategy providing more detail about where potential development might be proposed. One that is more reflective of the distinctive spatial characteristics of the Plan area and its geography/geology.

As it stands it totally ignores the intimate relationship between the geography, geology, cultural history and the localised use of vernacular building materials. As a result scant attention is given to sites specifically able to supply building stone that relates to local vernacular architecture.

**C**

20. The preferred scenarios which have not been followed through to the MWLP and have spurious accuracy. As a result they are not sufficiently robust. For example ED 1 Blencowe Quarry first preference but reserve site for originally for waste and then for limestone has now been withdrawn as part of the quarry had been developed as a caravan site. This surely means that another quarry site is needed in the locality yet the plan has no second reserves to meet this contingency thus the plan lacks robustness. In addition one must ask what are driving forces behind these allocation changes and what are the impacts on the planned demand?