

PLANNING & LICENSING COMMITTEE
2nd March 2021
ADDENDUM REPORT

Report No.	Item No.	Application No.	Applicant	Parish
17/2021	1	2020/0971/MIN and 2020/0972/MIN	Mick George Ltd	Greetham

Item 1 2020/0971/MIN & 2020/0972/MIN

Additional Comments Received:

Rutland CPRE

I write as Chair of CPRE Rutland.

Notwithstanding the issues raised by others to the principle of a further extension to Greetham Quarry, CPRE is confining its comments to the issue of restoration.

The restoration scheme, as amended, appears to address the environmental issues raised. However, based on past performance, there can be no confidence that restoration will be carried out in accordance with the details provided or within the prescribed time frame.

This contention is based on the situation in relation to the existing quarry where, apparently, extraction has ceased but where restoration work has not been carried out in accordance with conditions attached to the planning permission. This, despite the requirement for work to have been completed by September 2020.

If this further quarry extension is to be approved, CPRE Rutland considers that it should be on the basis that:

- the proposed new access to the highway is constructed and ready for use before quarrying commences in the extended area.
- restoration of the existing quarry is completed, to the satisfaction of the LPA, before quarrying in the extension commences, to be secured by a legal agreement.

In addition, the phasing of the restoration measures within the quarry extension should be clearly set out so that monitoring of the implementation can be expedited. This is of paramount importance in ensuring that the landscape and habitats are re-instated within the approved time frame and to the required standard.

Malcolm Touchin

Questions received

(Officer response in italics)

North Western Extension

- Can the planners guarantee that there will be no harm to the health of Greetham's residents from PM10 dust emissions?

The applications have been assessed by our Professional Officers in Environmental Health. They are content that the conditions recommended will enable the quarry to operate without harm to

health and within recommended guidelines. The conditions are tighter than for the original quarry and involve better monitoring, complaints and reporting procedures.

- Do the RCC officials who have recommended approval of the application, have full confidence in the applicant's consultant dust and noise reports?

Having assessed them yes. RCC EHO's have post graduate qualifications in acoustics and have over 35 years experience. Further details are still to be submitted for approval under the conditions before work can commence.

- Has the planning officer who did the bulk of the work on this application, Shari Macdonald visited the site in the last 12 months?

No, but this is a red herring and is wholly irrelevant. She has visited the site before, her Manager Phil Watson has visited recently as has the Case officer from RCC. Ms Macdonald was in full possession of the documents, plans, photos and characteristics of the site and has extensive experience dealing with minerals matters for Northants CC.

- Have the planners taken into account the situation at Wakerley Quarry where a video in the public domain shows a large dust cloud being generated by the applicants workers and no action being taken to prevent this happening.

Wakerley Quarry is a different site and cannot be compared to Greetham. Northants CC have been liaising with the operator there and have reached solutions to improve dust issues. On the day of complaints it had been demonstrated that the wind was away for Barrowden.

- Are the planning committee aware that in March last year, after dust complaints, that MGL refused to stop quarrying when requested to do so by the Environmental Health Officer?

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

- What action did Rutland County officials take when presented with a petition from the village complaining about noise and dust from the existing quarry?

The complaint was investigated by the RCC EHO

- What are the legal grounds for not imposing a bond or escrow to ensure restoration of the quarry, given the failure of the applicant to restore the existing quarry?

The NPPF states that a bond should only be required in exceptional circumstances. This has been explained to the Parish and Liaison Group already. Those circumstances are for where there is a very large scheme starting, up, where innovative techniques are proposed or where the operator has a track record of financial or technical issues. None of these apply in this case. The operator does not wish to enter into such an arrangement and cannot be compelled into doing so in the light of the NPPF.

- What examples can the planners quote where a quarry has been given permission to extract this close to residential property?

Unknown – Greetham Quarry is/was close to the village and the extension would be a similar distance, but with better controls than before, including working and operational activities (crushing) further away than previously permitted. This is not a question that is relevant to the decision before you which must be based on the current proposals, the development plan and other material considerations. Continuous noise monitoring is also uncommon but being imposed here due to the particular circumstances.

- Does RCC have the resources to monitor and enforce the planning conditions for this new quarry when they were unable to do so in the existing quarry?

RCC has a full time Enforcement Officer. Northamptonshire CC also has specialist minerals officers. In the event of a complaint the matter can be investigated together with the evidence from the monitoring equipment required by the conditions. This again is irrelevant to the determination of the application and could not constitute a reason for refusal.

An on-line petition against the quarry has been set up and has 332 signatures As of 0930 today. The text of the petition reads as follows:

We object to the Greetham Quarry Extension due to impact on air quality, traffic congestion, noise, impact on village life, proximity to people's houses, and the fact that the original planning agreement to restore the quarry was broken and the landscape remains unrestored.

The local area is surrounded by beautiful countryside. The quarry extension will be even closer to the village than the original quarry. Bringing with it very serious health implications. Public Health concerns are a huge factor when it comes to our objections. Dust in the air which contains particles harmful to our families lungs and can lead to long term health issues, an increase in traffic from the heavy lorries coming in and out of the site is adding to the pollution. In 2021 when we know of the impact such things can have on our health, the fact this is even being considered is outrageous.

The feelings of a 12 year old girl living in the village sum this up beautifully in a letter she has written to the council below:

This quarry extension is such a bad idea for my village. It is too loud and sends dust into the air that is bad for us and the horses nearby. I have developed asthma since I moved here 8 years ago and I think the dusty air from the quarry is bad for my lungs. I love to be outside in the fresh air and I am sad that some of my friends will have the quarry right next to their houses. It makes our windows, cars and roads filthy and lands on the food we grown in our garden. Please do not put money ahead of our well-being. Surely there must be other places to find stone that are not so close to houses.
JD aged 12.

Available here:

<http://chnq.it/FGPBDCW2>