

My name is Karen Anderson and I've lived in Cookley for 22 years.

My Daughter Mel Anderson very much wanted to speak today but sadly her nerves got the better of her. Mel has a learning Disability and is on the autistic spectrum. She also struggles with severe anxiety at times and sadly she is unable to be here today due to a major meltdown last night worrying about today.

If it's ok with Mr. Woolcock, I would like to submit Mel's letter to you and I will read out her letter on behalf of her. Thank you.

When I heard that the decision reached by Mr. Normington last year had been quashed

of it is way over my level of education. A fact that NRS are very aware of and the term "blind them with science" comes to mind.

However, I think I got the gist of it, and I believe I understood enough. Enough to say that there is absolutely nothing in those documents that I have seen that causes me to change my mind, reduced my fears or altered any of my objections.

So, although my original objections all stand, my concerns surrounding noise and dust/air pollution are probably the things that scare me the most, and are the areas most likely to impact me and my Daughter. So I concentrated on those sections and tried to understand what changes and alleged improvements had been made.

The changes that have been made to the revised proposal, that I noted were -

Proposed mineral plant to be reduced in size, with reduced operational acoustic volume

.

Reduced footprint

S.1 (hd0 ptd (u)-21 (n)-29 (d m)4 (s)-5 reuutdsgh.o athd0 pted 1 (9 (t)15(s)ed (u))10 (ac(pstd (u)-21c)e

So in terms of noise level, NRS conclude (in the revised proposal), that with the changes regard to normal and temporary operations.

It is not always about the level of noise, it is often the continuous noise, that you can't get away from that causes stress. Who will NRS? Noise level measurements, in real life are irrelevant if the constant sound is causing you harm. What is relevant to me is the close proximity of so many vulnerable children and elderly residents. An adverse impact on one person, may cause a great deal of harm to others. Or our elderly residents with health issues who are housebound and will be subjected to it day in day out.

My other main concern relates to dust and air quality. So I looked at that section next.

As a consequence of using the quieter plant, the Appellant is stating that some of the bunds can be reduced in height from all.

Bit confused about the bund directly in front of the McDonald's window though. In the referring to Phase 1. All they will see is a bund directly outside their window and a bit of sky if they're lucky.

I completely fail to see how reducing the height of bunds is an improvement. I had never heard of bunds before last year's Inquiry but googled it in relation to quarries. The environment", doesn't that include potentially harmful dust particles?

Z Z Z > á

weed) over leaving ugly lumps across the site. Whether it's an "acoustically soft" lump of dirt or not. This doesn't sound like much of an improvement to me, and I suspect, to not many other people either.

decrease in local air quality will occur due to the proposed development at Lea Castle Farm Quarry. " Unlikely? But it might.

application.

"It remains concluded that, with the implementation of standard dust mitigation and control measures, (were those not in place in the original application or have they just been implemented in the improved version?) the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in dust levels. So they've now removed the term "Unlikely" and are claiming "would not".

"Receptors" are people by the way, human beings, we are known as Receptors! Receptors are expendable. I'll let Mrs Jones know about the monitoring and complaints log. Her garden backs on to the site, she has COPD, and she's absolutely prospect of having a quarry virtually in her back garden for the rest of her life. She might be comforted by the knowledge that she can log any complaints and that the air quality will be monitored.

So that brings me to my biggest worry of all. Silicone dust particles. Authorities, laws, policies and quarry operators continue to state that dust particulates in quarry sand are not hazardous to health. There are pages of reports and assessments contained in Appendices attached to these documents that "prove" this. However, it is true that are

No doubt back in the early 1900's, the same was being said of asbestos, despite medics and factory employers already becoming aware of the potential problem. The took till 1999 before ALL types of asbestos were banned in the UK.

As yet, data on the link between silicone dust and respiratory diseases has not been collected, for people living close to a quarry, only quarry workers themselves. So no

harTjEMC4B2 (o)-9 10C0i1

I ç - ç Qç ç ç ç > ç ç ç ç

babies right through their formative years. Elderly residents with existing health conditions are scared that what years they have left are going to be shortened.

Even if we could be convinced there is no risk from silicon dust, everyone knows, ç ç ç ç ç 3² ¥-Î On a breezy day, parked cars, roads, windows of nearby properties will be covered in dust. Kids in playgrounds that will be covered in dust. + ç s Î ç particularly if you are doing so every day for years!

I don't want myself, my Daughter, my friends, neighbors or any children ending up as a

and so many decisions to Reject. Lea Castle Farm is a totally unsuitable location for a quarry. Please do the right thing.

Thank you for your time.

Karen Anderson
Cookley Resident