

Proposed Sand and Gravel Quarry, Lea Castle Farm

Planning Inspectorate ref: APP/E1855/W/22/3310099

Response on Rule 6 Party Impact on Local Amenities: Chapter 4 Public Rights of Way

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The proof of evidence provided by Rebecca Hatch on Public Rights of Way (Chapter 4) makes reference to 'Dust and Air Quality' in several sections.
- 1.2. This rebuttal therefore specifically deals with these comments where raised specifically in relation to 'Dust' and / or 'Air Quality' and Public Rights of Way (PROW).

2. STQC Comments

2.1. I deal specifically in the following with comments raised as follows:

- 1: Paragraph 4.14: Putting a quarry conveyor under a bridleway is not a good idea for several reasons:

Sub-paragraph 4.12.3: Dust and Air Quality: Quarry conveyors often release dust as they transport materials. Even with measures in place, dust can rise to the surface through cracks or openings, impacting the air quality along the bridleway. This could not only

would be transient, and people and animals would only be expected to present for short periods of time as part of the normal pattern of use of the land.

- 3.8. Following the disamenity dust assessment methodology as set out in my Proof, the pathway effectiveness in regard to bridleway 62.6(B) where it bisects the Site would be highly effective. This would result in a low risk of dust impacts and slight adverse effects at most. Potential risks and effects at the eastern stretch of PROW 62.6(B) where it runs along the northeastern edge of the Site would be reduced to negligible.
- 3.9. On completion of works in the western part of the Site potential risks and effects at PROW 62.4(B) would be negligible.
- 3.10. As further discussed in the Original ES [CD1.03] and noted in my Proof the recommended conditions imposed by WCC on the granting of any planning permission would include conditions mandating the Site be operated in accordance with a Dust Management Plan (DMP). The content of the DMP would be subject to approval of WCC. Typical standard mitigation measures would include visual monitoring and would include monitoring the status of the PROW 62.6(B) running through the Site, and the implementation of any appropriate mitigation as required.

4. Summary

- 4.1. The comments raised by Rebecca Hatch do not alter my overall conclusions that the proposed development would not result in significant or unacceptable adverse impacts.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

K. Hawkins, Partner

BSc MSc MIAQM MEured