

Appellant Response to Relevant Additional Interested Party Responses

The Appellant has now had a chance to review all the additional interested party submissions and respond on the basis of the responses outlined below:

Carole Pannell (rID178)

Ms Pannell's written submission sets out that her son is a hydrogeologist and raises the following points:

- What elevation/level is the groundwater table at? [Our present understanding is that it is c.5m below the site base – assuming these measurements are accurate.]

Appellant Response - As set out in CD1.13 Technical Appendix I – Hydrological and Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, mineral extraction will be undertaken entirely within the unsaturated zone of the aquifer: the available data indicates that the lowest planned sections of extraction and subsequent infilling will reside between c.16m and c.24m above the water table.

- Is the groundwater in the loose sands or is it in competent sandstone bedrock? [We understand that groundwater is found in both loose sand and bedrock.]

Appellant Response – The water table is contained in the Sherwood Sandstone Group aquifer.

- Is there a plan to dig deeper than the water table? See note below.

Appellant Response – There is no plan to dig deeper than that indicated on the plans submitted for the original scheme and amended scheme.

- Does the plan for the quarry involve dewatering to allow for dry working of the materials?

Appellant Response - Operations to be carried out as part of the Proposed Development will not intercept the water table; thus there will be no sub-water table working or dewatering.

- How many monitoring bores will be installed around the quarry into the sands and sandstone? [We understand this to be only one.]

Appellant Response – Draft condition 20 (Revised Schedule of Conditions – Original Appeal Scheme and Amended Scheme) sets out that no mineral extraction shall take place until a groundwater, surface water level and quality, monitoring scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority.

- Will groundwater be tested to check for contamination – especially for hydrocarbons?

Appellant Response – This will be controlled by the monitoring scheme to be submitted to the Council for approval prior to extraction works would take place.

- Will a wheel wash be installed on site?

Appellant Response – Details of a wheel washing facility, including its location shown on a plan, water supply, water storage, recycling and disposal, and maintenance arrangements will be submitted to the Council as set out in draft condition 20 (Revised Schedule of Conditions – Original Appeal Scheme and Amended Scheme).

- Will there be any processing undertaken on site requiring groundwater supply? This may only be necessary if the sand needs washing to remove clay.

Appellant Response – Any water required for processing will be taken from a mains supply.

Jan Porter (rID109)

- Ms Porter queries whether lighting conditions could be included sensitive to bats

Appellant Response - For lighting, operational / working hours are such that lighting will principally not be required. Where it is needed during the winter months only, within the sunken quarry plant site area, all lights would be minimal, downlighting and motion sensed – these details would be subject to a submission under draft condition 24 (Revised Schedule of Conditions – Original Appeal Scheme and Amended Scheme), which includes for measures to minimise the impact of lighting upon protected species and habitats such as bats.

Joanna McNeill (rID184)

- Ms McNeill reports of a silicosis diagnosis

Appellant Response - From a review of the Stop Lea Castle Farm Quarry Facebook page it would appear Ms McNeill is from Australia and hence presume these comments relate to having worked at an Australian quarry (see attached screenshot of Facebook post at Appendix 1).

No clear evidence is provided that working at the quarry was the cause of the claimed silicosis or if it was, what the specific circumstances of that quarry and the working environment were. Also worth noting that chronic silicosis results from long term exposure to respirable crystalline silica (10-20 years typically cited), acute can arise but would be from very high short term exposure.

The following key points can be made:

- Health and safety regulations, environmental regulations, dust controls and climate vary from country to country and so very difficult to make comparisons of experiences in different jurisdictions;
- It is accepted that quarrying activities may give rise to respirable crystalline silica (exposure to which may cause silicosis), along with other industries including construction, stone masonry, etc. However risks are primarily associated with activities that mechanically break the silica containing material with greatest risks to workers in enclosed environments;
- The proposed development does not include blasting or other significant rock breaking activities;
- Processing does include for some crushing but does not require use of a large crushing plant and involves the use of water along with other dust management measures to minimise dust generation; these measures also serve to minimise the risk of RCS from the site;
- Extensive other in-design and management measures are in place to minimise the risk of generation and release of dust, which again serve to minimise the risk of any RCS emissions;
- HSE advice remains valid in that there have not been any documented cases of silicosis in the general public in the UK. As stated by the HSE this indicates that environmental (i.e. general ambient air) exposures to silica dust are not sufficiently high to cause silicosis. Silicosis is recognised as an 'occupational disease' and there have been documented cases of silicosis within workers.

Mark Jones (rID157)

- Mr Jones in his written submission sets out that he has been an arborist for 20 years and have also been a horse owner for 10 years. Mr Jones raises concerns regarding the encroachment within the RPA of trees and suggests a need for increased RPAs around retained historic trees. Mr Jones notes that the site survey for these trees states it is only valid for 12 months and was carried out in 2019. Asks for confirmation whether an ecologist report has been completed and the dates and validity period of this report?

Appellant Response – Detailed provisions for the protection of trees on site are set out specifically in draft conditions 42, 44 and 46 (Revised Schedule of Conditions – Original Appeal Scheme and Amended Scheme).

An updated Ecological Assessment was carried out in October 2024 (rID7), which included for an assessment of mature and semi-mature scattered trees recorded across the site.

Appendix 1 - Screenshot of Facebook Post

Morning all! I posted a while ago about an Australian lady called Joanna McNeil who contracted silicosis after 7 years of working 90m from a quarry. I messaged her on social media whilst the first quarry was going ahead, but she never saw my message. I found her on Instagram and sent her another message, and by some miracle she saw it and replied to me this morning. She is as horrified as we all are about the thought of this quarry going ahead. I've spoken to her in depth thi... See more



45 comments 4 shares