



Planning & Development Unit
Shire Hall
Gloucester
GL1 2TH

Our Ref: 21/04198/CPO

Your Ref: 21/0050/CWS73M

30th November 2021

GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Variation of condition 2 (revise restoration date from 25.11.2051 to 31.12.2034); Condition 3 (revise working scheme including revised location of stone processing shed and replacement office/welfare facilities) and condition 7 (revise export limits to 100,000 tpa from 50,000 tpa for 3 years) relating to planning consent 14/0101/CWMAJM for extension to an existing quarry, dated 21/05/2015 at Oathill Quarry Temple Guiting Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL54 5SG for David Jarvis Associates Ltd

Thank you for your consultation of 22.09.2021 for which we have the following observations:

Following Consultation with Environmental Regulatory Services for noise, air quality and contamination concerns were raised in relation to air quality and noise. As such, additional information is requested.

Cotswold District Council's Environmental Regulations Services have commented on the application as below:

Environmental Health - Air Quality:

"Concerns have been expressed by some local residents about levels of dust generally in the vicinity of the B4077 highway which it has been suggested is due to levels of quarry traffic.

We note that following the 2014 planning permission the applicants consultants recommended measures should in place to control fugitive dust, whether from quarry operations themselves or from vehicles leaving the site. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement that includes an Air Quality chapter that considers the effects of the proposals on local air quality and dust generation. This concludes that the development if permitted is unlikely to have an insignificant adverse effect upon local air quality. I accept that this may be the case in respect of airborne nitrogen dioxide but I do not believe that sufficient evidence has been presented for me to determine the situation as regards dust.

The Air Quality chapter acknowledges that dust is a potential planning concern and has scoped in a qualitative assessment of the construction dust impacts. However this is not discussed in any further detail. I would expect as a minimum a review of the effectiveness of existing dust prevention and control measures, as this was identified as a potential issue for the 2014 application, with of course smaller volumes of quarry product being moved from site. These dust control measure were required by planning conditions and set out in the dust management plan. In particular the review would take into account dust measurements taken at receptors in the vicinity of the site, as was set out in the existing dust monitoring scheme of August 2015. This data has not been referred to in the reviews.

I do not believe that I can make a fully informed decision on this application until these matters are addressed and in particular for the dust monitoring information to be made to me and included in the assessment."

Environmental Health - Noise

"Concerns have been expressed by some residents (Ford) about the levels of noise impact from current HGV traffic flows through their tranquil hamlet. The additional proposed 5,000 HGV movements per annum compared to current permitted levels is of concern in light of current complaints from Ford residents. A number of Ford properties are very close to the road and individual HGV vehicles can be clearly distinguished in the traffic flow. Some residents of Ford argue that the increase in HGV movements will not simply be negligible. I tend to agree, as the subjective nature of noise means that there is not a simple relationship between noise level and the impact on those affected. This will depend on how various factors combine in any particular situation. Whilst it may be true that an increase in noise level of 0.1dB may not be perceptible within the context of the existing aural environment. Individuals dont hear decibels, they hear specific sounds and the sounds of HGVs passing through Ford, albeit at the speed limit required, is unmistakable, even at current flow levels. I have made some roadside noise measurement and subjective observations of HGVs passing through Ford in the summer of 2021. Can the applicants therefore be asked to comment on the maximum (LAFMax) noise levels produced by HGVs as measured in Ford. I am especially referring to tables 3.8 and 3.9 Range of monitored noise levels and Typical levels. In the former table, levels of 99dB [LAFMax] are shown. These are very loud/high sound levels. But how were the so called, lower typical levels, derived from the data?

I do not believe that I can make a fully informed decision until these matters are addressed."

Robert Weaver

Chief Executive