

## 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:

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 - k5gnW410 k616 05 Fing1 of 70 water ring. b2.2 (e)-9[(D)-(h)(l (ymi)-4.8 (0)-4.8 0 Tc [17On)-4

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

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

Mark Jones

## Appendix 1 - S

Morning, all I posted a while ago about it an Australian lady called Ingrid, who I had contracted

to do a 7 day course for 7000 for work

going ahead  
Instantly and

3:12 PM