

About the application

Application number: 2023/91418	
What is the application for?:	Importation of infill materials to restore a former quarry
Address of the site or building:	Woodhouse Quarry, Woodhouse Lane, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2QR
Postcode:	NN12 7LS

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
RE Application - 2023/62/91418/W0	
<p>I would like the following points to be taken into consideration when this application is discussed.</p> <p>No mention of the ultimate aim of the ~20 luxury log cabin holiday letting business / camping business with associated shops and café; why is this not considered in this same application? Is this going to be approved eventually, if not then why 'remediate' (infill with hopefully inert waste hardcore) the site at all? An earth bund and revegetation could be a neat way to segregate the site and promote wildlife to return</p> <p>No tree or vegetation survey provided despite being identified as likely required, why is this?</p> <p>Foul sewage disposal method identified as 'unknown' in the planning application document, this doesn't seem sufficient or acceptable.</p> <p>No contamination management data / management practices / contaminated land reports provided to give a baseline and forward view on what is manageable / tolerable – particularly relevant from the sensitive potable water receptor below</p> <p>No air quality assessment is provided</p> <p>No details on fill materials / sourcing / provenance / type / contamination status or controls have been provided</p> <p>No noise assessment has been provided, merely allusion to on-site crushers, 26 HGV movements per day and a potential for more based on the references to 'saleable stone' which will presumably be done from the site, adding more vehicle movements. Does the noise assessment also include a geohazard vibration assessment element? This seems to be a complaint of other local homeowners as intrusive effects even beyond 'attenuated earth bunding' for sound</p> <p>I support the need for a comprehensive ground investigation with contamination status, material properties, groundwater considerations and impacts to potable water aquifer usage being of direct relevance to our household. However, there is no set of objectives / acceptance criteria specified for the scope of the ground / site investigation, suggest the council should set this up front to emphasise the expected coverage of the activity</p> <p>No dust management plan is provided</p>	

no dust management plan is provided

Working hours are designated, how will these be controlled? Relying on citizen reporting is insufficient and will lead to tensions / potential violent encounters with the quarry operator. What deterrents / controls do the council actually hold?

KC Highways team assessment response notes a 'Section 106; Annual maintenance fee of £25,000 per annum for the maintenance of White Gate Road, Linshaws Road and Bare Bones Road' – who pays for this sum? It would be circa £37,500 for the 18-month period of the works, is this the council (i.e. the tax payer, whom get no benefit from this planning permissions approval) or the quarry developer (preferably)? What happens to any requirement for funding above this threshold, from where is it sourced? This need is highly likely due to the poor state, width and construction of the roadways around Cartworth

Environment Agency response notes that a previous contaminated land status assessment has been arrived at this site or within close radius of, noting the end use of the site as one for holiday lettings (which may include structures which will collect landfill gases emanating) where is this assessed and controlled within the application? We assert it is not considered adequately and would negate the ultimate end use of the site

The supplied hydrogeological assessment states (section 2.4 'the vulnerability of groundwater beneath the site to a pollutant discharged at ground level is classified as 'high' and section 2.6 stating 'Groundwater quality may be locally impacted by the mixed waste landfill within the adjacent Woodhouse Quarry void and other adjacent landfill and quarry activities.'

The hydrogeological assessment report identifies there are no groundwater quality samples it is considering for analysis (section 2.6) – this is a convenient omission as I recall seeing over several years the presence of mobile fuel bowsers containing heavy fuel oils such as kerosene / diesel presumably used by earth moving plant at the site. Conditions and safeguards relating to spillages were not strong and I assert there will be spillage and infiltration under the site related to these sources of contamination from during the operational period of the quarry. The massive contaminated land report does not seem to mention mobile fuel storage items either, see section 3.2.3 excluding this as a potential source. How did they fuel the quarry plant historically you would simply ask?

Also, the hydrogeological report ignores entirely the potable water well I have at Hill House as my only water supply. The well is several hundred years old and far precedes regulation, however it is the main source of potable water for a number of the dwellings and residents. Impacts to this specifically are therefore not considered by the developer at all. This substantially undermines their report and conclusions.

The transportation report makes a series of nonsense remarks about passenger car units. The traffic will be almost exclusively HGV and Plant, with some LGV/car usage by workers. No one is going to commute on foot or by bicycle that is clear. The heavy wear on the White Gate road which is in poor delaminated condition already is certain. The road is already in a poor condition from use by another quarry. The developer's transportation agent don't support maintenance funding the road through their discrete excessive wear.

Ultimately, if the site is remediated and the HGV/plant traffic stops, the next phase of the development is still envisaged to be 20 luxury log cabins (i.e. at least 20 cars daily, 40 movements), plus a shop (perhaps 40 cars daily, 80 movements) and a café (perhaps another 40 cars daily, 80 movements). So in summary we're likely to be looking at 200 car movements additional daily at least, and these will come from all

directions, not just the proposed route the developer notes for this phase. We'l