

## **SLEG COMMENTS ON THE TEARSALL APPLICATION**

SLEG's position on the Tearsall application was neutral, as our concerns are with Longstone Edge. But now that part of the planning gain on offer is on Longstone Edge, our position is that what the applicant is offering as planning gain is derisory.

This is the second time that Glebe has offered not to dig up Peak Pasture, the most sensitive part of Longstone Edge scenically, in return for a permission elsewhere. Last time, the Section 106 agreement that was the planning gain in return for the Winstar permission was overruled by the High Court when subjected to judicial review. We believe that the same would happen again if, this time, SLEG were to seek a judicial review of what is on offer. We believe that the undertaking on Peak Pasture is no more than a crude form of blackmail. As a minimum, the Authority should be seeking an undertaking that Peak Pasture will be made safe from quarrying for all time. Both Glebe and your officers know how, we believe, this could be done.

We have no wish that Ineos's operations in Runcorn should go out of business. But Ineos have now had over a year to sort out Glebe since they bought the company. What have they done to ensure that China no longer breaks World Trade Organisation rules by restricting fluorspar exports? What have they done to ensure that there are no more leakages from the settling ponds at Cavendish Mill that have flooded homes in Stoney Middleton and seriously polluted Stoke Brook and the River Derwent. What have they done to introduce new processes that are available and would do away with the need for the settling ponds altogether?

What have they done to ensure their future sources of fluorspar by resuming less environmental damaging underground mining and by investing in Cavendish Mill so that it can process a much higher proportion of mined fluorspar than the derisory 10% on offer several years in the future?

Ineos/Glebe are the new neighbours of many of SLEG's supporters. They have not made a good start as our neighbours.

Any further fluorspar permissions in the National Park need to be consistent with an agreed plan for fluorspar. This should insist on:

- 1) A rapidly growing proportion of fluorspar from underground mining;
- 2) Making safe and subsequently taking out of use the settling ponds at Cavendish Mill;
- 3) Making safe from exploitation for all time environmentally sensitive areas such as Peak Pasture.

If Ineos/Glebe believe that the cost of this is too high, then the response must be that the environmental cost of a British fluorine industry is too high. Tourism is the life blood of the Peak District in the same way that chemicals are the life blood of Runcorn. The survival of one must not be at the expense of the other.

5 December 2008