
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2016

by Elizabeth C Ord LLB(Hons) LLM MA DipTUS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q2371/W/15/3137918

Grange Hill Exploration Site, Off Grange Road, Singleton, Poulton Le Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 8LP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Cuadrilla Bowland Limited against the decision of Lancashire County Council.
 - The application Ref LCC/2014/0084, dated 15 May 2014, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2015.
 - The development proposed is permission for a three year period to retain the existing site compound and access track, install seismic and pressure monitors within the existing well; undertake seismic and pressure monitoring; plugging and abandonment of the existing exploratory well and restoration of the site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a three year period to retain the existing site compound and access track, install seismic and pressure monitors within the existing well; undertake seismic and pressure monitoring; plugging and abandonment of the existing exploratory well and restoration of the site at Grange Hill Exploration Site, Off Grange Road, Singleton, Poulton Le Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 8LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref LCC/2014/0084, dated 15 May 2014, and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the Appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the impact of the proposal on landscape character and visual amenity; and
 - whether the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the heritage significance of St Anne's Church and/or the character or appearance of Singleton Conservation Area.

Procedural Matter

4. No Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken and interested parties have objected to this. However, the proposal has been

screened by both the Council, and by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State, and found not to require an EIA. I am satisfied on the evidence before me that the proposal is not EIA development for the purposes of the Town and County Planning (EIA) Regulations 2011.

Reasons

Landscape Character and Visual Amenity

Landscape

5. The site is within open countryside surrounded by fields, hedgerows, ponds and woods, with Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) crossing the locality. It is a very gently undulating landscape with the site lying in a slight dip. A few scattered farmsteads are apparent in the vicinity, some possessing large, functional looking agricultural sheds, and in the wider area there are caravan parks.
6. The site lies off Grange Road, which links to the nearby A585 trunk road to the east, on the junction of which there is a highways maintenance depot containing a large, modern, dome-like building and several sheds and portakabins. The same junction also contains a small glass works. Electricity pylons cross the fields in the middle distance. To the west of the site, off Grange Road, there is a cluster of dwellings beyond which lies St. Anne's Church and the village of Singleton. There are other dwellings in the wider area.
7. The site falls within National Character Area 32: the *Lancashire and Amounderness Plain*, and at County level within the *Coastal Plain* Landscape Character Type 15 and, more specifically, in *The Fylde* Local Character Area 15d. Characteristics of this landscape are described as low lying, gently undulating farmland with red brick farmsteads, blocks of planted woodland, ponds and many man-made elements such as pylons, masts, roads and road traffic. I find this to be an appropriate description of the area as I observed it on my site visit.
8. The Appellant's *Landscape and Visual Appraisal* of May 2014 assesses the local landscape as being of medium sensitivity. However, whilst the Council concurs with much of this appraisal, its own *Landscape Assessment* suggests the Appellant has underestimated the value and sensitivity of the landscape. In my judgement, the landscape is not particularly sensitive due mainly to the man-made features in the vicinity, some of which are functional and utilitarian in appearance, and because of the moving traffic along the reasonably busy A585. Therefore, I accept the Appellant's evidence and find that the landscape is of medium sensitivity.
9. I now turn to the magnitude of change. The 0.99 hectare site, consisting of a hard standing compound, access track, well, earth bund and perimeter fence, was apparently developed in around 2010 after obtaining a temporary permission. The proposal would involve the retention of these features for a further 3 years and, in addition, seismic and pressure monitoring equipment would be installed in the existing well, although I understand this equipment would be underground and, therefore, would not add to the landscape impact.
10. However, a work-over rig would be brought onto site for a few weeks for the installation and removal of the monitoring equipment. For this short period, other infrastructure would be required including an office, welfare facilities, mud tank, wire-line unit, service rig, and lighting, the latter of which would be

low level, facing inwards and downwards to keep it to a minimum. Restoration of the site, which would involve the use of machines and equipment, would take between 6 and 14 weeks depending on weather conditions. Otherwise the site would have a similar appearance to its current state throughout the 3 year period.

11. The Appellant's appraisal assesses the site as currently having a very small magnitude of impact, resulting in an overall close range minor significance of effect, reducing to negligible further away from the site. It states that the proposed development would not vary these conclusions and consequently the impact would continue at the present level. The Council, on the other hand, takes the view that the magnitude of change would be large and emphasises the need to consider the baseline position as that which existed before development took place.
12. Taking the Council's baseline approach, I have first considered the change that has already taken place, and which would continue for most of the three year period. This has been followed by an assessment of the change which would occur for the weeks when the rig and other equipment was in place.
13. The existing site appears reasonably unobtrusive in the landscape in the context of other man-made features, and its influence is limited to a short range due to the lay of the land and screening effects of vegetation. The grassing over of the earth bund and the green coating on the perimeter fence mitigates its effect and allows the compound to be absorbed satisfactorily into the surroundings. The impact would also be temporary and reversible with no residual landscape effects. Therefore, in my judgement, the magnitude of change currently is and would, for most of the time of the permission, remain low.
14. However, for the weeks when the installation/removal equipment was present, the scale of development, height of the rig, night-time lighting, and associated longer range of influence, would increase the magnitude of change. Nonetheless, due to its very short duration, in my judgement, the overall magnitude of change would remain low.
15. Consequently, having found the landscape sensitivity to be medium and the magnitude of change to be low, I find that the scale of effect of the proposal would be slight at close range, reducing to negligible further away. Consequently, there would be no significant harm to landscape character.
16. Although the Council suggests that the compound is larger than is necessary for the proposed operations, I accept the Appellant's position that it would be impracticable to renovate only part of this relatively modest-sized site, and to attempt to do so would cause unnecessary disturbance and adverse impact.
17. Whilst interested persons have raised the issue of cumulative effects, the minimal impact of the proposal would not unduly add to that of other development in the area.

Visual Impact

18. The Appellant and Council agree that visibility of the site is limited. On my visit I drove along Grange Road and noted that, whilst it is visible from certain view points on the road, from others it is obscured by the topography and vegetation. Although in some vantage points looking west, it is seen in the

same view as St. Anne's Church, the church is in the distance with just its steeple protruding through the trees. Glimpsed views are available from the glassworks. Looking east from the road, the site is seen against the background of more prominent man-made features, such as the highway depot sheds and traffic on the A585. From other surrounding roads, the site is hardly visible.

19. Although the site is clearly apparent from the nearest PRow to the south, it is seen in the same view as utilitarian features, such as sheds and buildings, and often against a background of hedges and trees, which softens its effect. From the PRow running from St. Anne's Church and from the church itself, the site is barely visible through the trees.
20. There are no residential properties in close proximity and, due to the surrounding topography and vegetation, it is unlikely that significant views of the site would be had from the nearest dwellings set back from Grange Road. From more distant properties on Pool Foot Lane, the site is not currently visible, although the rig and lighting might be seen in the distance for the short time of their existence.
21. Whilst there would be some visual impact at close range from the road and PRow, apart from the short time the rig was in place, the proposal would not be visually intrusive. Further afield, the effect would reduce substantially with distance. Consequently, taking account of perceptual and experiential factors, as well as physical features, and bearing in mind both the Appellant's and Council's visual assessments, in my judgement there would be no overall significant visual impact.

Policy

22. As the proposal would have no significant impact on landscape character or visual amenity, it would not conflict with Policy CS5(iv) of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (LMWDF), adopted in February 2009, which seeks, amongst other things, to protect the character of Lancashire's landscapes.
23. It also satisfies Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LMWLP), adopted in September 2013, which, amongst other things, supports minerals and waste operations that demonstrate that all material social, economic and environmental impacts that would cause demonstrable harm can be eliminated or reduced to acceptable levels.
24. Furthermore, there is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, in recognising the intrinsic beauty of the countryside¹, requires the protection of valued landscapes².

Heritage

25. St. Anne's Church is a Grade II listed building that lies on slightly higher ground to the site and which, according to the Council, is about 840m from the site entrance, forming a visual link with Singleton Conservation Area. The church lies on the edge of the conservation area and the site forms part of its

¹ NPPF paragraph 17, 5th bullet

² NPPF paragraph 109, 1st bullet

- wider setting. Whilst the church is visible in the distance from the site, it is largely screened by intervening vegetation and the surrounding topography. From the church and the edge of the conservation area, the site is barely visible, although the rig and other infrastructure might be apparent in the distance for the short periods they would be in place.
26. On this basis, the setting of the church would be no more than negligibly impacted during the weeks the rig was in place, but otherwise it would be unharmed by the development. There would otherwise be no impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.
27. As there would be no significant harm to the church and conservation area, LMWDF Policy CS5(ii), which seeks to avoid harm to heritage assets, would not be breached. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the NPPF, as the public benefits of evaluating the Bowland Shale's potential contribution to energy security and provision of economic opportunities, clearly outweigh any negligible harm³.
28. It is also noted that heritage was not a reason for refusing the application and the first time it was raised by the Council was in its appeal statement. No heritage objections have been raised by Historic England or by Fylde Borough Council.
29. Consequently, having special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings⁴ and paying special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area⁵, I find that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the heritage significance of St Anne's Church or the character or appearance of Singleton Conservation Area.

Other Matters

30. Ecological issues have been raised by third parties. However, the site has already been constructed and the Appellant's *Ecological Appraisal* indicates that there is unlikely to be any significant impact on protected species or species of conservation concern, subject to mitigation measures on the timing of key aspects of the development. On this basis Natural England raises no objection, indicating that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on the Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site, and that it can be screened out from any requirement for further assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. There is no technical evidence before me to the contrary and consequently I accept the Appellant's evidence and find that in ecological terms the development is acceptable subject to conditions.
31. Noise is a concern for some people. However, the site is some distance away from residential properties and I understand that the monitoring is a very low noise activity. Noise from the erection and dismantling of infrastructure and restoration would only last a short time and would not be intrusive to sensitive receptors, given the separation distance. Restoration activities would be required in any event, regardless of the outcome of this appeal. Consequently,

³ NPPF, paragraph 134

⁴ Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

⁵ Section 72(1) and (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- subject to an appropriate condition, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable in regard to noise impact.
32. Objections have been made by interested persons on the grounds of flooding and pollution risks. However, the site is located in Flood Zone 1, which is deemed to be at lowest risk of flooding and, according to the Appellant's *Flood Risk Assessment* there are no material problems with drainage or flooding.
 33. Whilst the site is within 100m of a watercourse, an impermeable on site membrane is designed to prevent liquids flowing off site and penetrating into soils and groundwater, and spill kits would also be available. Groundwater would be further protected from the contents of the well by steel casing, cement sheaths and other mechanical isolation devices within the well.
 34. There is no technical evidence before me to suggest any issues with flooding or pollution and the Environment Agency (EA), who regulate such matters, have raised no objections. Furthermore, the NPPF indicates that the planning process should focus on whether development is an acceptable use of land, leaving pollution matters to other control regimes⁶. For all these reasons I accept the Appellant's evidence and find that the proposal is acceptable in land use planning terms with respect to flooding and pollution risks.
 35. Concerns have been raised about ground instability and seismic impacts similar to those that arose previously at the Preese Hall site. However, the proposal does not involve hydraulic fracturing but is simply a monitoring process to understand reservoir pressures within the Bowland Shale and to establish natural levels of seismicity. The evidence suggests that such testing is unlikely to result in any earth movements that would cause significant vibrations. Furthermore, there have been no objections by any of the regulatory consultees. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable on land stability grounds.
 36. With regards to concerns about waste management, I understand that there is no intention to add fluids to the well and, therefore, no additional waste well fluids should be created. In due course existing wastewater and fluids from the well would be collected in sealed storage tanks and removed and disposed of by licensed operators in an appropriate waste treatment facility. The process would be regulated by the EA, who has raised no objections. Therefore, in the absence of any technical evidence demonstrating a material waste management risk, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable in this respect.
 37. There are objections based on the risk of well failure, unpredictable gas build up, proximity to an ethylene pipeline, transport of chemicals and the process potentially being unsafe. However, there is no technical evidence before me to suggest that the process would be unsafe and it would be regulated by a number of agencies, including the Health and Safety Executive, the EA and the Oil and Gas Authority, all of whom have raised no objections and whose requirements would all have to be met. Consequently, I am satisfied that for land use planning purposes the proposal is acceptable in this regard.
 38. The issue of traffic disruption and accidents has been raised. However, there would be few traffic movements to and from the site apart from the short periods when plant was required to install and remove monitoring equipment

⁶ NPPF paragraph 122

and during restoration, although the latter would have to take place in any event to restore the existing site. The site is close to the main highway network and the Appellant's *Transport Assessment* concludes that the proposal is acceptable in highway terms. There are no objections from the Highways Authority or Highways England. On this basis, and in the absence of technical information to the contrary, I accept the Appellant's evidence and find the proposal to be acceptable with regard to highways issues.

39. The suggestion has been made that the monitoring site could be located in an industrial area due to the extended reach of horizontal drilling. However, the proposal uses an existing well site, which I have found causes no significant adverse impacts and, therefore, the existing location is acceptable.
40. With respect to the legality of the Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence, this is not a land use planning matter and is outside the scope of this decision letter.

Conclusion

41. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause any significant impact on landscape character and visual amenity, and nor would it cause unacceptable harm to the significance of St Anne's Church or the character or appearance of Singleton Conservation Area.
42. It would be in accordance with the development plan read as a whole and does not conflict with the NPPF. It accords with the three dimensions of sustainable development⁷, to which the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies⁸. It also sits well with the Government's *Shale Gas and Oil Policy: Written Statement* of September 2015. Consequently, on this basis I allow the appeal subject to conditions.
43. Taking account of the NPPF, the Planning Practice Guidance, the Council's suggestions and the Appellant's and interested parties' comments thereon, I have imposed a number of conditions. These are contained in the attached schedule and the reasons for imposition are set out below each condition.
44. All conditions are agreed between the Appellant and the Council with the exception of a well abandonment condition (former condition 17). The EA's original request for this condition was withdrawn on the basis of the EA having now developed a regulatory position for the management of waste generated by abandoned oil and gas wells drilled before 1 October 2013. Coupled with the EA's permitting controls for the protection of ground water, I understand that the EA are now in a position to satisfactorily regulate the well abandonment matters covered in former condition 17. Therefore, former condition 17 is no longer necessary and has not been imposed.

Elizabeth C. Ord

Inspector

⁷ NPPF paragraph 7

⁸ NPPF paragraph 197

Schedule of Conditions

Time Limits

1. The development shall commence not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Imposed pursuant to Section 91 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The testing and monitoring operations authorised by this permission shall cease and the site be restored in accordance with condition 17 by not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Imposed pursuant to schedule 5 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policy SP2 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan.

Working Programme

3. The development shall be carried out, except where modified by the conditions to this permission, in accordance with the following documents:

- a) The Planning Application and supporting statement received by the County Planning Authority on 23rd May 2014 as amended by the letter from Arup Ltd dated 30th January 2015.
- b) Submitted Plans and documents:
 - Figure 1
 - Figure 2
 - Figure 3
 - Drawing showing stratigraphy in Grange Road borehole
- c) All schemes and programmes approved in accordance with this permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to enable the County Planning Authority to adequately control the development and to minimise the impact of the development on the amenities of the local area, and to conform with policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and policies SP2, EP15, EP16, EP19, EP23, EP24, EP26 and EP27 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan.

4. No works involving the installation, removal or maintenance of the pressure and seismic monitoring equipment or well abandonment and site restoration operations shall take place except between 31st March and 31st October in any year. Outside of those times, visits to the site shall be limited to those occurrences described in the letter from Arup Ltd dated 30th January 2015. The mitigation measures for ecology described in the letter from Arup Ltd dated 30th January 2015 shall be employed at all times during works undertaken during the over wintering period.

Reason : To ensure the protection of ecological interests and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policies EP15 and EP16 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan.

5. No topsoils or subsoils shall be exported from the site. All such soils shall be retained for use in the restoration of the site and shall be stored in mounds retained in a fully grassed weed free condition throughout the duration of their storage.

Reason: To ensure the proper removal and storage of soils to ensure satisfactory restoration and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Hours of Working

6. No delivery or removal of materials, plant or equipment, site development or well abandonment or restoration works shall take place except between the hours of:

07.30 to 18.30 hours Mondays to Fridays (except public holidays)

07.30 to 13.00 hours on Saturdays (except public holidays)

No delivery or removal of materials, plant or equipment, site development or well abandonment or site restoration works shall take place at any time on Sundays or public holidays.

This condition shall not apply to operations requiring the installation of a workover rig including installation and removal of monitoring equipment and perforation of the casing or to the carrying out of essential repairs to plant and equipment used on the site.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies - Part One.

Highway Matters

7. Heavy goods vehicle traffic to and from the site shall follow the route provided in accordance with the submitted Transport Assessment throughout the lifespan of the development.

Works and routing signage shall be provided in accordance with the submitted Transport Assessment throughout the lifespan of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies - Part One.

8. All vehicles associated with the development, operational or restoration phase of the development shall park in the site. No vehicles associated with the development shall park on Grange Road.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies - Part One.

9. All vehicles shall enter or leave the site in a forward direction.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies - Part One.

10. Measures shall be taken at all times during the site construction, operational and restoration phases of the development to ensure that no mud, dust or other deleterious material is tracked onto the public highway by vehicles leaving the site.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and local amenity and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Site Allocation and Development Management Policies - Part One.

Control of Noise

11. All plant, equipment and machinery used in connection with the operation and maintenance of the site shall be equipped with effective silencing equipment or sound proofing equipment to the standard of design set out in the manufacturer's specification and shall be maintained in accordance with that specification at all times throughout the development.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policy EP27 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan.

12. Noise from site operations between the hours of 22.00 – 07.00 shall not exceed a level of 42dB(A) Laeq free field when measured at the boundary of the following properties at a point closest to the noise source.

- a) Pointer House, Fleetwood Road
- b) Singleton Grange, Grange Road.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and adjacent properties/landowners and land users and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and Policy EP27 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan.

Floodlighting

13. Flood lighting shall only be utilised at the site during the works necessary to install and remove the pressure and seismic monitoring equipment and those works associated with the perforation of the borehole. At such times the floodlighting of the site shall be managed so that it is the minimum necessary to

illuminate the working area and shall be orientated to minimise light spill to locations outside of the site boundary.

Reason: To minimise light pollution from site activities and to conform with policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Safeguarding of Watercourses and Drainage

14. Provision shall be made for the collection, treatment and disposal of all water entering or arising on the site to ensure that there shall be no discharge of contaminated or polluted drainage to ground or surface waters.

Reason: To safeguard local watercourses and drainages and avoid the pollution of any watercourse or groundwater resource or adjacent land and to conform with policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

15. All foul drainage shall be discharged to a public sewer or else to a sealed watertight tank fitted with a level warning device to indicate when the tank needs emptying. Upon emptying, the contents of the tank shall be removed from the site completely.

Reason: To safeguard local watercourses and drainages and avoid the pollution of any watercourse or groundwater resource or adjacent land and to conform with policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

16. Any chemical, oil or fuel storage containers on the site shall be sited on an impervious surface with bund walls; the bunded areas shall be capable of containing 110% of the container or containers' total volume and shall enclose within their curtilage all fill and draw pipes, vents, gauges and sight glasses. There must be no drain through the bund floor or walls. Double skinned tanks may be used as an alternative only when the design and construction has first been approved, in writing, by the County Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard local watercourses and drainages and avoid the pollution of any watercourse or groundwater resource or adjacent land and to conform with policy DM2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Restoration

17. Site restoration shall take place in accordance with the following:-
- a) All plant, buildings, hardstandings, aggregates/ hardcore, lining systems and fencing shall be removed from the land.
 - b) The upper layers of the subsoil material shall be subsoiled (rooted) to a depth of 600mm with a heavy-duty subsoiler (winged) prior to the replacement of topsoils to ensure the removal of material injurious to plant life and any rock, stone, boulder or other material capable of preventing or impeding normal agricultural land drainage operations, including mole ploughing and subsoiling.

- c) Following the treatment of the subsoil, topsoil shall be placed over the site to a minimum depth of 150mm and shall be ripped, cultivated and left in a state that will enable the land to be brought to a standard reasonably fit for agricultural use.
- d) Measures to relieve compaction or improve drainage
- e) The access from Grange Road shall be removed and reinstated to an agricultural access including the reinstatement of any roadside hedge.

Reason: To secure the proper restoration of the site and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Aftercare

18. Within 3 months of the certification in writing by the County Planning Authority of the completion of restoration, as defined in this permission, a scheme and programme for the aftercare of the site for a period of five years to promote the agricultural afteruse of the site shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing and shall be carried out as approved. The scheme and programme shall contain details of the following:

- a) Maintenance and management of the restored site to promote its agricultural use.
- b) Weed control where necessary.
- c) Measures to relieve compaction or improve drainage.
- d) Management of any tree or hedge planting including replacement of failed plants, maintenance of protection measures and weed control.
- e) An annual inspection to be undertaken in conjunction with representatives of the County Planning Authority to assess the aftercare works that are required in the following year.

Reason: To secure the proper restoration and aftercare of the site and to conform with Policy DM2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Definitions

Completion of Restoration: The date the County Planning Authority certifies in writing that the works of restoration in accordance with condition 17 have been completed satisfactorily.