

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

In the matter of an appeal by Mr Larry Edmunds

To be heard at an inquiry

For the Restoration of Stowey Quarry by landfilling of Stable Non Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) and inert wastes

Appeal No. APP/F0114/A/13/2195706

Application no. 10/05199/EFUL

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF
COUNCILLOR VICTOR PRITCHARD**

1. My name is Vic Pritchard of Stowey Mead, Stowey, Bishop Sutton, Bristol. I am the Ward Councillor for Chew Valley South at Bath and North East Somerset Council. I live approximately 1 km from the proposed waste site. I made representations to the Council on behalf of my constituents in 2011 and 2012.
2. In 2011, my representations were to the planning committee determining the application after an earlier deferral of the matter. At the meeting on 6.7.11 I objected to the proposal on behalf of local residents on the basis of general environmental concerns; along with Councillor Jeremy Sparks as adjoining ward member for Clutton. One point that was obvious to me was that it simply seemed madness to approve a hazardous waste site that was situated on top of a windy escarpment where a local community and regionally important water resource sat below the site.
3. At the meeting in September 2012, I repeated my objections of the previous year but raised additional matters such as the introduction by that stage of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and that the proposal was contrary to the principle of sustainable development. I also noted that there were increased ecological concerns with new evidence as to the presence of White Clawed Crayfish close to the site.
4. A copy of my statement prepared for the 26.9.12 meeting is attached at Appendix VP1. There is genuine fear and anxiety locally about living

below a hazardous waste site and particular one that will accept asbestos. There is additional concern that the site has not been managed or regulated well in the past and, although local residents would be disturbed by, say, locally quarrying operations, a poorly managed site accepting asbestos from all around leaves people horrified.

5. In the circumstances, I ask that the appeal be dismissed.

5.8.13

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

In the matter of an appeal by Mr Larry Edmunds

To be heard at an inquiry

**For the Restoration of Stowey Quarry by landfilling of Stable Non Reactive
Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) and inert wastes**

Appeal No. APP/F0114/A/13/2195706

Application no. 10/05199/EFUL

**APPENDICES TO THE PROOF OF
COUNCILLOR VICTOR PRITCHARD**

1. Statement to the Council's Planning Committee meeting of 26.9.12.

Appendix VP1

Stowey Quarry application: 10/05199/EFUL

Statement :

You will all have been in receipt of a report from the Stowey Sutton Action Group, which is an excellent professional evaluation of local knowledge regarding Stowey Quarry.

This report clearly demonstrates that Stowey Quarry is unsuitable for use as a hazardous waste dump.

Referring to the Officer report, I am encouraged to see its recommendation to refuse, but I do believe the refusal needs to be far more robust.

Should the Committee refuse the application, and the applicant be minded to appeal this decision, I believe it will be important for the Planning Inspector to be aware concerns additional to that stated in the Officer recommendation.

Therefore, not only do I urge the committee to refuse this application based upon the Officer recommendations, I also ask that additional reasons be included.

I understand that all Members have will have received an inventory of concerns from the Action Group.

From this list, those reasons which I believe could be relevant material considerations are as follows:

. Stowey Quarry was ruled out of the West of England Joint Waste Strategy as not being required. One of the reasons cited for not allocating this site was the need the protect water resource, a principle concern locally.

Furthermore, the objection by Bristol Water raises concerns under the Precautionary Principal, which is stated in EU environmental policy.

. The evidence from independent experts on land instability. There is historical evidence of land slippage, and it is impossible to predict when further slippage may occur.

. The consent which relates to HGV movements associated with the Quarry takes no account of the levels of noise and congestion.

. Noise from the site will result in nuisance to neighbouring properties, and could well exceed 10decibels, which the technical guidance to the NPPF states it should not wherever practicable.

. The risk of dust from asbestos fibres on a windy elevated location.

. An increase in the height of the land by 10m to accommodate more waste will result in an unacceptable detrimental visual impact on the landscape.

. The objection from ecology expert refers to the presence of White Clawed Crayfish

near to the site. There is a legal requirement to assess the potential impact to crayfish, which I have to assume has not been done.

. The NPPF states that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, which this application does not.

These are the principle points I have extracted from the Action Group's submission. However, I would welcome the inclusion of other points should the committee feel it appropriate.

I sincerely hope the committee will take all these issues into account in reaching your decision.