

Denbighshire County Council
Town and Country Planning Act Section 78 Appeal



THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 79

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DETERMINATION OF APPEALS BY APPOINTED
PERSONS) (PRESCRIBED CLASSES) (WALES) REGULATIONS 2015

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (REFERRED APPLICATIONS AND
APPEALS PROCEDURE) (WALES) REGULATIONS 2017

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
PROCEDURE) (WALES) ORDER 2012, AS AMENDED

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Councillor Mark John Young

DENBIGHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

In relation to appeal by **Breedon Trading Ltd** against **Denbighshire County Council's** refusal,
as local planning authority (minerals planning authority) of planning permission for:

*Consolidating application for the extension of winning and working of limestone, importation of
inert waste and restoration to amenity land*

at **Denbigh Quarry, Plas Chambres Road, LL16 5US**

Planning application ref: 01/2022/0523

PEDW ref: CAS-03423-V9Z8M3

1. Qualifications / Experience

- 1.1. My name is Councillor Mark Young and I am the Chairman of the Planning Committee of Denbighshire County Council. I have sat on this committee from 2016 to 2025. I previously held the post of Lead Member for Planning during the elected term of 2017 to 2022.
- 1.2. I have approximately 10-years' experience of sitting on the Planning Committee (3 years as chairman) gaining experience handling numerous large and challenging applications. This experience comprises the determination of major and EIA planning applications including mineral extraction applications, unallocated housing developments and the North Wales Hospital development. I therefore have significant experience in weighing and balancing complex planning applications.
- 1.3. As a Planning Committee member I have received annual training on planning and received numerous updates on relevant planning policy .
- 1.4. It is worth noting that I voted in favour of the grant of the previous application at the quarry (01/2019/0757/PS) which was to allow the continuation of extraction of permitted reserves to 2028. I have also chaired the Denbigh Quarry Liaison Committee on behalf of Breedon and the local community since 4th May 2023, a position I still hold. I have been a member of the Quarry Liaison Committee prior to this, when the Committee did not have a formal Chair due to the absence of agreed formal Terms of Reference. That's said, I have been an active member of the Quarry Liaison Committee since 2019.
- 1.5. My involvement with the proposals subject of this appeal began when the planning application was taken to Planning Committee on 13th December 2023 where Denbighshire County Council resolved to refuse the application. On 23rd January 2024 a decision notice advising of the refusal was issued. It is this decision which is subject of this appeal.

2. The Planning Application

- 2.1. Planning application ref: 01/2022/0523/MA was determined on 23 January 2024. The application was refused planning permission for the following reasons:
 1. It is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed lateral extension to Graig Quarry would have an unacceptably negative impact on protected species and the special characteristics and features of the Crest Mawr and Graig Quarry Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Local Development Plan Policies VOE1 'Key Areas of Importance',

VOE 5 'Conservation of Natural Resources', PSE 16 'Mineral Buffer Zones', PSE 17 'Future Mineral Extraction' and guidance contained within adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 'Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity', Planning Policy Wales 11 (including updated Chapter 6), Minerals Technical Advice Note 1 'Aggregates', Technical Advice Note 5 Nature Conservation and Planning and Technical Advice Note 21 'Waste'.

2. It is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal contains insufficient justification for the development of an extension to the quarry and the restoration by importation of inert waste material, on an unallocated site in the open countryside. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Local Development Plan Policy PSE 17 'Future Mineral Extraction', and advice contained in Minerals Technical Advice Note 1 'Aggregates', Technical Advice Note 21 'Waste' and Planning Policy Wales 11 (including updated Chapter 6).
 3. It is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed lateral extension to the quarry would have a negative impact on the amenity and well-being of local residents. The Buffer Zones', PSE 17 'Future Mineral Extraction' and advice contained in Minerals Technical Advice Note 1 'Aggregates', Technical Advice Note 21 'Waste', the Development Management Manual and Planning Policy Wales 11 (Including updated Chapter 6).
- 2.2. The Local Planning Authority is no longer defending reasons for refusal 1 and 2 as set out above.

3. Scope of Evidence

- 3.1. My evidence covers the planning matters associated with the proposal and the reasons for refusal. This proof of evidence will set out why I consider the development is not acceptable in relation to the relevant policies of the Denbighshire Local Development Plan 2006 – 2021 (adopted June 2013), as well as other national planning policies and associated material planning considerations.
- 3.2. I also rely upon the evidence of the Council's other witnesses in relation to the amenity and well-being impacts upon local residents. Therefore, this proof of evidence should be read alongside the evidence of all other witnesses.
- 3.3. I am not a resident of the area around the quarry and so I am not resisting the application in any personal capacity. I am instead providing evidence to support the Member's planning judgment to refuse planning permission.

4. Relevant Legislation, Policy and Guidance

4.1. This section outlines the relevant legislation, policies and guidance which I consider are the most relevant to the proposed development and to inform my judgement.

Denbighshire Local Development Plan (DLDP) 2006 – 2021 (adopted June 2013):

- Policy BSC1 – Growth Strategy for Denbighshire;
- Policy PSE2 – Land for employment uses;
- Policy PSE15 – Safeguarding minerals;
- Policy PSE16 – Mineral buffer zones;
- Policy PSE17 – Future mineral extraction;
- Policy VOE1 - Key areas of importance;
- Policy VOE4 – Enabling development
- Policy VOE5 – Conservation of natural resources; and
- Policy VOE6 – Water management
- Policy VOE7 – Locations for waste management.
- Policy VOE8 – Waste management outside development boundaries

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity
- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Listed Buildings
- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Planning Obligations
- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note: Trees & Landscaping

Other Material Considerations

- Planning Policy Wales (PPW12) (Edition 12) February 2024
- Mineral Technical Advice Note 1 (MTAN 1): Aggregates (2004)
- Technical Advice Note 5 (TAN 5) Nature Conservation and Planning (2009)
- Technical Advice Note 11 Noise (1997)
- Technical Advice Note 18 Transport (2007)
- Technical Advice Note 21 (TAN 21) Waste (2017)
- Regional Technical Statement Second Review (RTS 2) (2020)
- The North-East Wales Statement of Sub-Regional Collaboration 2021 (SSRC)
- Towards Zero Waste (June 2010)
- Beyond Recycling (2021)

5. Appeal Scheme

Appeal Sites and Surroundings

- 5.1. Denbigh Quarry (also known as Graig Denbigh Quarry) is an active limestone quarry, located to the north of the town of Denbigh. The permitted site comprises approximately 28 hectares of land with the proposed extension area amounting to a further 5 hectares. The current use of the application extension area is predominantly privately-owned agricultural land used for grazing/pasture.
- 5.2. To the north, west and south, the contiguous land is rural, predominantly agricultural fields and woodland comprising pasture and a mix of ancient and more recent woodland. Crest Mawr Wood to the north west of the exiting Quarry and adjacent to the extension area is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and another SSSI (Graig Quarry) is situated 150 metres to the southeast. The existing quarry is, itself, bound on the east by Ffordd y Graig/Graig Road, with the Colomendy Industrial Estate situated further to the east.
- 5.3. The Quarry is accessed off Ffordd y Graig/Graig Road via a purpose-built access road. To the south of the quarry entrance is a concrete batching plant, also operated by the applicant.
- 5.4. The closest residential dwellings are located to the south of the quarry over 250 metres away from the existing and proposed quarry boundary.
- 5.5. There is one right of way that transects the extension area, and further there are a number of public rights of way that surround the site.

The Proposed Development

- 5.6. The Appellant seeks full planning permission for “Consolidating application for the extension of winning and working of limestone, importation of inert restoration material and restoration to amenity” (Planning Application Reference: 01/2022/0523/MA)¹.
- 5.7. The proposal seeks permission for a consolidating application which would effectively consolidate the current planning permission reference: 01/2019/0757/PS) at Denbigh Quarry, and in addition it includes a lateral extension

¹ The description of the development differs slightly on the decision notice to that set out in the application form (see bullet point above). The decision notice states “inert waste” rather than “inert restoration material” and “amenity land” rather than “amenity”.

to the west of the working area that would release approximately 4.4 million tonnes of saleable mineral to be worked over a period of 25 years.

- 5.8. Mineral released from the quarry via drilling / blasting would be processed at on site using mobile plant and sorted by size. Processed, saleable product would be loaded onto road-going HGV transport which then proceed to the public highway via the weighbridge adjacent to the site office.
- 5.9. Sales of limestone from the quarry would not exceed 500,000 tonnes (as previously secured by planning conditions attached to planning permission ref: 01/2019/0757/PS). The applicant has agreed to reduce the annual output limit by 20% to 400,000 tonnes per annum.
- 5.10. The site would be progressively restored over five phases using overburden and onsite soils and also by importing inert restoration material (100,000 tonnes per annum) derived from construction, demolition and excavation operations. This would involve progressive restoration as the extraction progresses into the next phase. The total volume of inert material imported to the site would be 1.7Mtpa.
- 5.11. Footpath 508/5 would be permanently diverted to allow for the proposed extension area.

6. Assessment of Harm

- 6.1. The only Reason for Refusal that the Council are maintaining is Reason for Refusal No.3 which refers to the proposed lateral extension to the quarry having a negative impact on the amenity and well-being of local residents. I therefore accept that the only harm which the Council are alleging against this proposal is the negative impact on the amenity and well-being of local residents, and the breach of Policy PSE16, PSE17 and Technical Advice Note 1 'Aggregates', Technical Advice Note 21 'Waste', the Development Management Manual and Planning Policy Wales 12.
- 6.2. In my view the appropriate approach in assessing this reason for refusal is threefold:
 - Firstly, whether there is credible evidence of harm to amenity and well-being;
 - Secondly, whether that harm results in policy conflict;
 - Thirdly, if such conflict is found, whether that conflict would justify the refusal of permission when weighed against any benefits.
- 6.3. This section addresses the first two questions; the final one is dealt with in the planning balance (section 7).

Evidence of Harm

- 6.4. In terms of the first question—whether harm exists—I have considered the evidence of Ms Chiara Sirianni and Ms Sioned Sellers, both of whom provide compelling, first-hand accounts of how ongoing and historic quarrying operations have affected their lives and the lives of others in the local community.
- Ms Sellers offers credible, consistent, and sincere testimony of the emotional and physical toll of the blasting operations. Her evidence helps humanise what are often highly technical planning considerations.
 - Ms Sirianni articulates a community-wide sense of psychological distress, rooted in the unpredictable and intrusive nature of quarrying, particularly blasting. Her testimony aligns closely with hundreds of written objections and community sentiment.
- 6.5. These are not isolated incidents. Hundreds of residents have submitted detailed written representations to the Minerals Planning Authority opposed to the planning application which have been provided to the Inspector as part of this appeal citing harm to their amenity and well-being. These are not mere expressions of preference; they are a reflection of deep and enduring disruption. The evidence of Ms Sirianni and Ms Sellers should therefore be seen as representative, not exceptional.
- 6.6. The technical evidence regarding noise and vibration is not in dispute, but amenity harm is a subjective and experiential issue.
- 6.7. The harm experienced by the local community cannot be dismissed solely because they fall within certain guidance thresholds or standards.
- 6.8. This harm experienced by the local community is exacerbated by the intermittent and inconsistent blasting notifications from the quarry, ranging from 8 days' notice, to no notice at all (see Appendix 1). This creates a landscape of uncertainty and stress for residents. In some cases, notification has been given and later withdrawn, should the quarry blast not take place for a particular reason, compounding the anxiety and uncertainty over forthcoming blasts. This long-term pattern enhances the intrusive nature of operations which leads to a direct and demonstrable erosion of amenity which is detrimental to the well-being of residents both physically and mentally.
- 6.9. I consider that extending quarry operations for a further 25 years would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact on amenity. This community has endured quarrying for approximately a century. There is a threshold beyond which continued impacts become unreasonable in a modern planning context. This proposal, in my view, crosses that threshold and harms the amenity and well-being of local residents.

Policy Conflict

6.10. I turn next to the question of policy conflict that the above identified harm raises.

6.11. These circumstances, in my view, engage and breach key local and national planning policies and published guidance. Specifically, policies PSE 16 (Mineral Buffer Zones) and PSE 17 (Future Mineral Extraction) of the Denbighshire Local Development Plan, TAN 21 (Waste), MTAN1 (Aggregates) and PPW12.

6.12. Policy PSE16 of the DLDP states (emphasis added):

Sensitive development within buffer zones, as defined on the proposals map, will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that working has ceased and will not be resumed.

*Extensions to quarries **will only be permitted** where a suitable buffer can be retained, i.e. where such an extension would not cause other development to become part of a buffer, and where **it can be demonstrated that there is no unacceptable impact on the environment or human health.***

6.13. Policy PSE17 of the DLDP makes similar provision stating (emphasis added):

- i. Application for the working of minerals within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will not be permitted unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.*
- ii. Applications for the extraction of aggregate minerals will only be permitted where it is necessary to maintain stocks of permitted reserves having regard to the Regional Aggregate Working Party apportionment figures, or, where no figure exists, the demonstrated need of the industry concerned.*
- iii. Applications for the extraction of up to 1 million tonnes of sand and gravel will be permitted in Preferred Areas (identified on the proposals maps); taking into account the above criteria.*
- iv. Applications that accord with the above criteria will be permitted provided that all the following criteria are met:*
 - v. An appropriate buffer is included, within which no mineral working or sensitive development will be allowed; and*
 - vi. Suitable access and transport routes are identified; and*
 - vii. Final reinstatement of public rights of way should be close to their original alignment with intermediate reinstatements where possible; and*
 - viii. Noise is kept to an acceptable level; and***
 - ix. Measures to reduce the impact of dust, smoke and fumes are implemented; and*
 - x. Suitable blasting controls are implemented; and***
 - xi. Impacts on groundwater and water supplies are found to be acceptable; and*
 - xii. An appropriate restoration scheme and after use is identified for the site*

- 6.14. It is considered that the lived experience of the communities shows a discord between accepted policy thresholds for assessing blasting and noise impacts and the impact upon local amenity and well-being. The above policies taken together aim to prevent unacceptable harm to amenity. The evidence from residents shows that noise is not being kept to an acceptable level and blasting continues to have an adverse impact on residents impacting their health (which includes mental health) in a manner which I consider to be unacceptable.
- 6.15. Therefore in my view PSE16 and PSE17 is breached.
- 6.16. MTAN 1 (Aggregates) has multiple relevant sections to this appeal, chiefly paragraphs 78-79 and 85.
- 6.17. Paragraph 78 of MTAN 1 sets out that “*blasting can result in impact which extend well beyond the extraction site*” and that “*this is likely to cause concern to neighbours*”.
- 6.18. Paragraph 79 of MTAN 1 identifies that:
“*It is often difficult to reconcile the needs of efficient and economic mineral extraction with the comfort and amenity of neighbours, particularly where quarries are located close to buildings that are sensitive to vibration such as residential properties. Research has shown that the vibration levels at which complaints are made varies significantly and that long established sites with a good relationship with neighbouring communities are far less likely to attract complaints from local residents.*”
- 6.19. Paragraph 85 of MTAN 1 sets out that: (emphasis added)
“*Where aggregates extraction and related operations occur close to areas that are sensitive to noise, particularly residential areas, noise impact must be minimised to acceptable levels. The effects of noise should be fully considered in formulating future proposals for aggregates extraction and noise emissions should be monitored throughout the permitted mineral activity. **Where the effects cannot be adequately controlled or mitigated, planning permission should be refused.***”
- 6.20. Taking the provisions of MTAN 1 together, it is clear that policy recognises the disruption and impact on communities proximal to mineral extraction particularly in relation to noise and the impact from blasting. Where these can be acceptably controlled then it is notable that MTAN recommends refusal – this reflects the ability of amenity impacts to outweigh the various planning benefits that are associated with mineral extraction.
- 6.21. Notably MTAN1 itself identifies that vibration levels at which complaints are made varies significantly. This suggests that levels of impact experienced by the communities proximal to quarries do not always align with statutory guidance. This

is precisely the experience of local residents as verified by Ms Sellars and Ms Sirianni. It also places an emphasis on a good relationship being an important part of potential mitigation – it is noteworthy from the evidence I have seen that residents do not feel they have a good relationship with the Appellant and I am not satisfied that this would change if the appeal were allowed.

6.22. TAN21 (Waste) states at paragraph 4.1:

“Where a proposal is environmentally unacceptable or would cause impacts on amenity and the problems cannot be mitigated to an acceptable standard by conditions, planning permission should be refused”.

6.23. The proposal before us is for mineral extraction but with restoration via the importation of inert waste of a substantial volume. The provisions of TAN21 are therefore relevant although I would accept that MTAN 1 is the more relevant of the two documents. But the advice note provides more support for refusal of proposals where conditions alone cannot address impacts upon amenity.

6.24. Planning Policy Wales Edition 12 has multiple relevant sections for this appeal, the majority of which sit within section 5.14.

6.25. Paragraph 3.21 of PPW12 states:

“Health impacts should be minimised in all instances, and particularly where new development could have an adverse impact on health, amenity and well-being. In such circumstances, where health or amenity impacts cannot be overcome satisfactorily, development should be refused.”

6.26. Paragraph 5.14.2 sets out that the role of the planning authority in relation to mineral extraction is to balance the fundamental requirement to ensure the adequate supply of minerals with the protection of amenity and the environment. Bullet 3 sets out a key principle is to:

“Reduce the impact of mineral extraction and related operations during the period of working by ensuring that impacts on relevant environmental qualities caused by mineral extraction and transportation, for example air quality and soundscape, are within acceptable limits.”

6.27. Paragraph 5.14.3 states:

“In certain areas, mineral extraction may not be acceptable. For example, where a proposal for mineral extraction would cause demonstrable harm to the environment, including designated sites, or amenity, which cannot be overcome by planning conditions or agreements, planning permission should not be granted.”

6.28. Paragraph 5.14.42 states:

“Mineral workings should not cause unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impact. Where this is not possible working needs to be carefully controlled and monitored so that any adverse effects on local communities and the environment are mitigated to acceptable limits. Any effects on local communities and the environment must be minimised to an acceptable standard.”

6.29. Naturally, local policy makes similar provision to local policy concerning the protection of amenity. It is considered that the lived experience of the communities shows a discord between accepted policy thresholds for assessing blasting and noise impacts and the impact upon local amenity and well-being. I consider the proposals would result in unacceptable impacts upon amenity and therefore referenced policy dictates permission should not be granted.

6.30. Paragraphs 5.14.47 and 5.14.48 of PPW12 set out particular provision concerning extension to mineral working. The first paragraph notes that an extension should be treated in the same manner as an application for a new site. The second paragraph notes that the presence of an existing quarry is a material consideration.

6.31. Whilst the existing quarry is a material consideration, it does not automatically justify an extension to the quarry, and the proposal should be treated like a new application. This is important in my view because it provides the policy support for the view that just because residents have previously lived with quarrying in this location does not mean they have to keep putting up with it. It is appropriate to re-examine the situation in the light of the considerable evidence from residents to conclude that an extension would not be justified.

6.32. Further to the above, decision makers must have regard to their duty under Section 3 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and look to ensure there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon the achievement of well-being objectives and ensure development is sustainable.

6.33. In accordance with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, decision makers are placed under a legal duty to act in a manner that seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This duty is enshrined in Section 3 of the Act, which establishes an overarching requirement to contribute to the achievement of the seven well-being goals, which includes **‘a healthier Wales’**.

6.34. This statutory duty is not aspirational it is binding. Public bodies, including those involved in the planning and consenting of mineral extraction, limestone in this case, must carry out sustainable development, as defined under section 2 of the Act, by acting in accordance with the economic, social, environmental, cultural and well-being of Wales.

- 6.35. In the context of this appeal, which would involve the extraction of limestone minerals if allowed, I consider that the development presents a high risk of adverse impacts on the amenity, health and well-being of the residents which I represent. Therefore, I consider that this would conflict with the achievement of multiple well-being goals including those related to '*a healthier Wales*'. Evidence to support this has been provided within the witness statements of Ms Sirianni and Ms Sellers.
- 6.36. Any unacceptable or significant adverse impact on the achievement of well-being objectives, such as community health and well-being, directly undermines the duty to act in a way that seeks to improve Wales' well-being in the long term.
- 6.37. Taking the above legislation and policy together, there is a clear requirement that new development must satisfactorily protect the amenity and well-being of local residents and communities. Cognisant of the above, I have therefore identified breaches with Local Planning Policies: PSE 16, PSE 17, and national policies contained within Technical Advice Note 21 (Waste), Minerals Technical Advice Note 1: Aggregates and the PPW. I will consider the impact of these breaches in the next section of my proof of evidence.

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1. Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.2. The relevant policies of the Denbighshire Local Development Plan, especially PSE 16 and PSE 17, carry considerable weight in protecting residents from cumulative and unacceptable harm. I consider that the proposed development does not align with those policies, and in my view these policies are of such importance to the determination of the application that the conflict with them brings the application into conflict with the development plan as a whole.
- 7.3. It is clear from abovementioned policy that unacceptable impacts of amenity can justify refusing permission despite there being other benefits which arise from the application. This reflects in my view the potential serious and long-lasting amenity and well-being effect that can arise from mining activities and operations. That is why it is made clear that planning permission should be refused where these effects cannot be mitigated.

- 7.4. I acknowledge the economic and employment benefits of continued extraction. However, these benefits are not new, nor are they unique to this proposal. They must be weighed against the long-term, cumulative and intensifying harm to community amenity and well-being.
- 7.5. The record of inconsistent blasting notifications; including specific examples such as 1-day notice in April 2023 and no notice in July 2023; has resulted in avoidable anxiety and ongoing distress of local residents. This uncertainty of waiting for a quarry blast to take place, or not, now constitutes an unacceptable burden that cannot be resolved via planning conditions or mitigation alone.
- 7.6. PPW12, MTAN 1 and TAN 21 reinforce the conclusion that unacceptable amenity impacts are a legitimate basis for refusal. This proposal falls squarely within that guidance.
- 7.7. In conclusion, I recognise the applicant's historic engagement and economic role. However, this application proposes a significant extension to quarrying activity that has already burdened the community for generations. As set out above – the fact that quarrying has occurred historically does not mean that quarrying has to continue into the future. The Secretary of State needs to consider the evidence before them which now includes detailed and persuasive evidence from residents real life experiences with the quarry. The evidence before this inquiry is clear: amenity and well-being impacts are real, cumulative, and no longer tolerable for the community that I represent.
- 7.8. Therefore, in accordance with policy, and in the public interest, I respectfully recommend that this appeal be dismissed.

8. Appendices

Appendix 1 - Blast Notifications Log

Appendix 1: Blast Notification Log

Date of notification by email.	Date of blast.	Comments	Number of days notification
06/06/2019	11/06/2019		5
02/07/2019	09/07/2019		7
13/08/2019	20/08/2019		7
26/09/2019	02/10/2019	Possibly meant to be 1/10/2019	6
16/12/2019	17/12/2019		1
20/01/2020	21/01/2020		1
03/03/2020	03/03/2020		0
03/06/2020	09/06/2020		6
02/07/2020	07/07/2020		5
26/08/2020	01/09/2020		6
21/10/2020	27/10/2020		6
19/11/2020	24/11/2020		5
14/12/2020	22/12/2020		8
20/02/2021	23/02/2021		3
12/04/2021	13/04/2021		1
19/04/2021	20/04/2021		1
08/06/2021	08/06/2021		0
26/07/2021	27/07/2021		1
27/09/2021	28/09/2021		1
01/11/2021	02/11/2021		1
29/11/2021	30/11/2021		1
17/01/2022	18/01/2022		1
08/03/2022	08/03/2022		0
04/04/2022	05/04/2022		1
09/05/2022	10/05/2022		1
01/08/2022	02/08/2022		1
21/11/2022	22/11/2022		1
06/02/2023	07/02/2023	Email notification on 8/02/23 to advise blast cancelled.	1
08/02/2023	14/02/2023		6
21/03/2023	21/03/2023		0
06/06/2023	06/06/2023		0
25/07/2023	25/07/2023		0
25/08/2023	29/08/2023		4
23/09/2023	26/09/2023	Email notification on 25/09/23 to advise blast cancelled.	3
25/09/2023	03/10/2023		8
06/11/2023	07/11/2023		1
28/11/2023	05/12/2023		7
11/12/2023	12/12/2023		1
22/04/2024	23/04/2024		1
19/08/2024	20/08/2024		1
27/01/2025	28/01/2025		1
05/05/2025	06/05/2025		1