

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: WSCC/028/21 OBJECTION
Date: 07 August 2021 14:08:46

OBJECTION

1. Continued winning and working of sand (WS/15/17)
2. Continued importation of aggregates up to 10,000 tonnes (DC/2151/07)
3. Continued importation of soils and peats up to 5.000 tonnes (DC/554/05)

Why were these permissions not determined separately before their expiry date (31.12.20)?

These have been allowed to continue unabated and we are still bothered by noise, dust, vibration, HGV's, heavy plant etc. Work should have ceased over 7 months ago!

Does this indicate that by hiding them in the main application Wiston/Dudman have no real financial interest in these lesser permits and they would only be of bonus value if the main application were to be approved?

Our right to object to these individually, as we have done in the past, has been denied.

OBJECTION WSCC/028/21

Restoration of Rock Common Quarry with inert materials.

Noise : My home lies 20m from the site boundary and 30m from the only vehicular access to the quarry. No assessment has been made for a massive increase in heavy plant vehicles entering/exiting the site during the construction/restoration phase of this plan, this would have a massive and very invasive increase in noise levels next to my home. Increased use of a road sweeper to try to control excess mud etc would also be very intrusive.

Increased working hours: The current operators only work 9-5, mon-fri with no saturday working. The proposed increase of working hours would be very intrusive especially on saturdays.

Dust & Pollution: Despite my property being identified in blue on figure A2 this is the only recognition of my home being within 20m of the site, no further mention of my property appears in the dust or air quality reports, and therefore no evaluations have been made. This would undoubtedly have a massive increase in dust/pollution levels at my home so this report is wholly unacceptable.

Vibration: No assessment has been made for multiple heavy plant using the quarry access next to my home. As we are already bothered by vibration from tracked vehicles any increase would exacerbate this issue.

Guidance given in the WSCC Scoping Opinion Document 4.41 has not been followed with regard for the above nuisances.

With the attendant noise, dust, fumes and potential health risks associated with this application,

myself and my family

would suffer a long term unacceptable and detrimental impact and a general loss of amenity for years to come.

Transport: This appears to be a desktop study. Collating data in a lockdown period and using estimates is totally unacceptable.

Now that Covid restrictions have been lifted transport data can now be collected more accurately and a new survey should be commissioned.

The applicants have limited their accident data regarding The Hollow junction/A283 to recent times, 2015-2019. This shows only 4 slight accidents, when the Biffa Windmill Quarry landfill was in operation between 2000-2004, 36 accidents were recorded at this location, 5 serious and sadly 1 fatal. This is a more accurate picture of what could happen if up to 500 HGV movements were allowed to use this junction. What was proved in "Biffa landfill times," was that no amount of wheel washing and road sweeping would stop the dangerous bends around this junction becoming extremely hazardous to motorists with excess mud and slurry being trailed out onto the A283. Complications could also arise when Rampion 2 and associated construction traffic passes close to the A283 around this junction.

Reception/Recycling Area: This would be located in the base of the closed Windmill Quarry landfill site. The applicants admit that this deep valley area is prone to flooding therefore it is totally unfit for purpose. Any works in this area, so close to the landfill site could be a potential contamination disaster.

Many references in the application are made to the "existing" tunnel/conveyor under The Hollow. This was dismantled, closed and backfilled nearly 20 years ago. WS/016/15 condition 8 clearly states "at no time whatsoever shall the backfilled conveyor tunnel be reopened", for the "protection of groundwater quality". How do the applicants propose to overcome this when it's an obvious pollution link between the two sites? Drawing number DRCL/RCRA/WP-02A clearly highlights this issue by showing the conveyor tunnel sloping downhill from Windmill into Rock Common! No account has been made for the possible vibrations that may occur from continuous use of the conveyor under the road. Cliff face disturbance around the tunnel was noted when it was last used in 1999. This and maintenance issues led it to be deemed unviable and ultimately closed.

Pollution: How can an expected 345,000 cubic metres of imported materials per year be monitored? Rock Common is a very sensitive site regarding water quality. It is not only above but also in a significant aquifer. Due to the depth of the quarry continuous de-watering is required. pollution could occur if transport operators deposited contaminated material into the site. this could be done when waste is misclassified accidentally or deliberately at the point of transfer then mixed with other material and used as infill.

Dewatering: Little has been mentioned about how it is proposed to keep the base of the quarry dry to enable infilling to start and then continue safely. Currently a large lagoon is located in the base of the quarry. Water is then pumped from the surface and onwards to the Honeybridge stream. It is not detailed how it is proposed to change this method other than "extending head works". Any disturbance

of the dewatering lagoon could cause polluted/poor quality water to be pumped into the Honeybridge stream.

A new well feature is proposed at the southern side of the quarry. Again very little detail has been included about this important aspect of the application. It must surely be a high risk strategy to totally rely on a new concept of dewatering. No water volumes from the new extraction point are detailed. It may be that a greater volume is needed to be pumped, given its location, in order to maintain a cone of water depression under the adjacent landfill sites. This could lead to flooding issues in and around Honeybridge stream.

Flooding: Quoting flow rates in the Honeybridge stream from 1965 is totally ridiculous. Data from 56 years ago is irrelevant in this current application. Surface water flooding data is also incorrect. The applicant states that the only flooding near the quarry was "1700m North of the site", (no date given). There has been no account of the more recent flooding from the Honeybridge stream. This occurred in October 2000, January 2008 and June 2012 when properties in The Hollow were inundated with water when the stream was out of bank after extreme weather. As you can now see flooding has brought misery to home owners and businesses next to the Honeybridge stream so any increases to water levels could be catastrophic. More research should have been carried out on this critical issue.

Wildlife: Infilling the quarry with landfill would totally devastate all of the wildlife in Rock Common. All natural habitats would be destroyed, a barren wasteland would gradually take over for many years.

There have been over 40 species of birds identified in the survey in and around the quarry including some rare and endangered species such as Peregrine Falcon, Sand Martins and the Linnet which is on the red list and of category 4 concern. These and the other birds would be displaced due to loss of habitats and nesting sites.

The Great Crested Newt (GCN) survey transpires, upon reading, as a very limited and poorly conducted study of a very important species. Only 3 of the 10 ponds identified as suitable breeding grounds within the 250m catchment area were eDNA sampled, these proved to be negative. The remaining 7 ponds were not sampled citing terrain difficulties for the Newts and for the surveyors. Covid restrictions and lockdown reasons were once again also cited. It was "assumed" by the survey team that the GCN were not able to cross a stream and scale the sand faces of the quarry to visit other ponds. It is clear that the GCN have been more resourceful than the survey team in visiting these ponds to breed as the GCN often appear in our garden just 20m from the site boundary. These sightings have been photographed and catalogued with the ARG UK & ARC. Despite admitting in their study report of more local GCN sightings from the SxBRC, the GCN has been discounted from living in an around the quarry. Natural England guidelines suggest a 500m catchment area be surveyed because "GCNs are very mobile and unlikely to stay in one place". It is imperative that a more robust survey is conducted in the next breeding season in ALL of the suitable ponds.

Many rare bat species inhabit the quarry, these would also be lost. Other identified mammal species such as Dormice and Badgers would be disturbed. We have Badger flaps installed on our boundary fences to allow unrestricted access for the Badgers to cross our property into the quarry and we would be devastated to lose these fascinating creatures. A myriad of insects, amphibians, reptiles and

invertebrates would all be lost.

Very little mitigation for the loss of wildlife has been made other than it may come back after 10 or more years. The report quotes "destruction of all existing habitats contained in the quarry" and "direct harm to flora and fauna (mortality)". This CANNOT be allowed to happen.

Timescale: Is 8-10 years really enough time to complete the applicants wish to infill Rock Common Quarry? To try to imagine the immense task this will be, a simple site visit to one of the view points into the quarry shows the enormity of this proposal. You can also see in the North-East of the quarry an area of Gault Clay imported from The Rough landfill site in 1998/99. It totals approximately 320,000 cubic metres. This small area compares to approximately 1 years worth of inert landfill (345,000 cubic metres). Times this area by 8 or 10 and you can see it has very little impact on the vast expanse of quarry. I would suggest a 20-30year or even longer timescale more appropriate. The sheer scale of the quarry has been conveniently under estimated.

With the Cemex site at Sullington accepting 1.8 million tonnes of inert waste, would there really be a sustainable supply of materials locally for another 4 million tonnes needed to fill Rock Common? This could lead to HGV's coming from out of the County to expedite the infill. This would obviously have associated traffic concerns.

Government policy on what is or isn't suitable landfill material is ever changing and inevitable tighter restrictions will be imposed. Encouraging more and more recycling, whilst massively beneficial to the country as a whole, in this instance would further limit infill, thus further increasing the timescale. Even WSCC's own policy of "Zero Waste to Landfill by 2031" would not be achievable. I have grave concerns this project would never be fully completed and left as a half finished eye sore, blighting the local landscape for many, many years to come.

The future: Rock Common Quarry must remain essentially as it is now- unspoiled. The limited sand extraction could be allowed to be completed in the 2 year timescale it could have some limited restoration using material already available in the quarry, then securely fenced and left for nature to continue to take over and flourish.

The applicants state under "need" that the sand cliff faces are unstable and must be shored up with inert landfill to prevent any further erosion. Do they have evidence of recent cliff erosion or cliff falls? If so then this should have been recorded as per conditions 22 and 26 in (WS/15/97). It would appear from the site images contained in appendix D, D7 - D10 that nature has already taken over and naturally stabilised the cliff faces.

They also state to turn off the pumps would leave the quarry in a flooded and dangerous condition causing pollution to local water sources. As there is an ongoing requirement for the land owners (Wiston Estate), the operators (Dudman) and the past landfill operators (Biffa) to continue dewatering ad infinitum to maintain a safe water level under the adjacent landfill site, this in fact would never happen. So whether infilled with water as per ROMP scheme or landfill as per applicants, dewatering must continue. Thus securing a safe supply for the ecology of the Honeybridge stream.

Wiston Estate have had many years of royalties from sand extraction and landfill at Washington and it is now time for them to bear the financial

burden of keeping the water from rising without using Rock Common as a colossal piggy bank to help fund this and the running of their Estate. This application would only benefit Wiston and Dudmans who stand to make millions of pounds at the expense of many years of environmental damage and detriment to the local community.

If left to nature, coupled with the RIGS status of the quarry it would become a unique location in the South of England, a permanent and safe haven for the many rare and beautiful species already living there.

I consider I have a right to the quiet enjoyment and freedom from interference of my property, as expressed in the Human Rights Act 1998, especially as there is no public interest argument in favour of landfill at Rock Common.

Mr Robin Golds



-