

Mr Duncan Matthews

11th June 2017

Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Team

Plymouth City Council

Re: Land at Haye Road (Your Ref 1051) Conflict of Land Uses.

Dear Sir/ Madam

My representation/ letter dated 14th April 2017 to your team raised serious concerns on the accuracy of the quarry extraction and buffer zones as adopted in policy documents in 2007. My concerns are set out in detail in the previous letter with supporting evidence. In particular, how the potential extension boundary has moved north now impacting on proposed site 1051 adversely. But based on no accurate data. I have lived next to Moorcroft quarry for 20 years and have gained a lot of knowledge of the neighbouring operation in that time!

I met with Clive Tompkins (Senior Surveyor AI) on Wednesday 7 June. He shared AI's current plan for the extension of Hazeldene quarry dated January 2016. In my previous letter, I highlighted how the area occupied by the Golf Driving Range is affected by alluvium (clay, silt and sand) deposits. Going on to mention how clay is a real problem for their machinery. It is sticky, making it impossible to process. How this along with other issues may result in this area not being extracted at all. This 'IS' the conclusion of AI as well!! On their current map, the area of the Golf Driving Range is shown as 'barren/uneconomical' to consider extraction. I asked if this latest plan (January 2016) had been shared with PCC? Especially as there is a current review of the AAP. Apparently not!

The quarry extension boundary to the east of site 1051 is still showing potential extraction as far north as in previous plans. I have serious doubts that the limestone extends this far north for reasons I have already explained in the previous letter. Particularly, in any 'economical' depth to quarry! This affects Drake Memorial Park and Katrina Houghton's (Head of the PCC Bereavement Service) representation to provide an extended cemetery for Plymouth. AI must be made to core drill along the northern edge. So that an accurate plan can be produced. Especially, as it impacts on land outside of their ownership. It would not take many core drills (possibly four) to get a much more accurate plan for the northern boundary.

There are other major constraints on AI extending Hazeldene Quarry. I asked Clive if AI had investigated the feasibility and costs of moving the electric pylons and the 'massive' 500 mm high pressure gas pipe? Apparently not!! I have e-mails and the relevant contacts from both Western Power and Wales & West Utilities. To move this large infrastructure will costs circa £10 million!

More importantly, is still the question of feasibility. As the problem would be gaining the necessary wayleaves and easements to move the infrastructure. A lot of the area north of Hazeldene I understand is under option with a developer. Who would not want land sterilized with infrastructure that is suitable for housing.

The plan for Sherford is to move this infrastructure into a utility corridor south of the A38. It is then buried down the west side of the Sherford boundary and reconnected in the quarry extension area! Causing unnecessary costs, disruption and still not solving a problem to extend the quarry. Strategic Planning of Infrastructure might result in extending this corridor further west and reconnecting in Saltram Park that will always remain a 'green' space. It would be sensible for the developers of Sherford and AI to join forces to solve this issue, as it would save costs for both parties and solve a future problem for the quarry.

With the high demand for aggregate Hazeldene is practically at maximum extraction rates of 720,000 tonnes per year. Even with AI's plan to go deeper, they will run out of aggregate in approximately 15 years. So, an 'accurate', 'feasible' and 'costed' extension for the purposes of the AAP should be happening now! Sherford will be at an advanced stage in the next 10-20 years. So, more pressure will come on the land north of the Hazeldene Quarry extension. Possibly, if it is not 'economic' or 'feasible' to move the infrastructure in the quarry extension area, then even alternative land uses could be considered for it.

It has been suggested that I speak at the Planning Inspectorate Review. This request is now added to my first letter, so if necessary I will. But PCC managed to adopt a flawed plan produced by AI without scrutiny or involvement with the land owner. Perhaps someone senior in the Strategic Planning Team could save everyone listening to me and insist on an accurate review of the quarry extension based on core drilling data, rather than fantasy!

It is impossible to Strategically Plan 'anything' unless you are in possession of 'facts'!!!!!! The FACTS are as follows: -

- 1 FACT. The ground south of site 1051 is 'barren/uneconomical'. Therefore, the areas adopted in the policy documents for extraction and buffer zone in this area are 'false'.
- 2 FACT. The thrust fault, otherwise northern limit of the limestone was found much further south in Moorcroft's existing pits 3 & 4 than shown on the BGS maps. Therefore, to plan accurately a few inexpensive core drills need to be conducted.
- 3 FACT. The bed of limestone is described as 'dipping southwards at angles between 15-25 degrees'. Therefore, AI would need to assess where the limestone starts at an 'economic' depth to quarry! Pointless stripping land for a couple of metres of limestone.
- 4 FACT. AI have been fobbing off PCC when Hazeldene will need to be extended. They are already 20 years ahead of planned extraction, with only 10-11 years in the pit! Even with the revised depth to 84 metres below sea level, the area to work diminishes. So, in

approx. 15 years when AI need to expand, all the points I am raising will need to be known. This requires planning now, in this review of the AAP.

- 5 FACT. No one has investigated the 'feasibility' or 'economic reality' of significantly moving the large infrastructure that is in the way of the adopted plan. I have and it is a major £10 million consideration! Strategic Planning of Infrastructure might suggest looking at this in conjunction with moving the pylons and 500 mm high pressure gas pipe for Sherford. It could be the only cost effective way to move it! Otherwise, in the Joint Local Plan Review it may be that other reserves such as at Linhay Hill Quarry, Ashburton becomes the alternative major resource of limestone in the area. With the extension area of Hazeldene sterilized with infrastructure that cannot be moved.

I expressed to Clive that the last document provided by AI and adopted as policy by PCC would have been useful if it was printed on soft paper! Also, to expect both PCC and myself chasing for an accurate revision of the Hazeldene extension from AI based on fact. Taking into account all the considerations in the area.

To conclude, I reiterate my statement in my first letter "the plan as adopted for this area is 'unsound' has 'not been prepared properly' and does have 'legal' implications with blighting land that should be free to be considered for alternative land uses". The AAP of 2007 states "mineral extraction at Moorcroft and Hazeldene Quarries should be planned so not to compromise strategic development options". Which is not the case at present! Therefore site 1051 can then be reconsidered under previous representations for residential use. As supported by the PCC Preferred Option Report of July 2005 where PCC championed residential as their chosen land use for this area. May I ask that someone senior in the Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Team review this situation and for the first time communicate with the land owner. I request that this letter is attached to the one dated 14th April 2017 for the Planning Inspectorate to review, as it includes new information gained from a recent meeting with AI confirming what I already knew. I look forward to your feedback on this situation.

Many thanks.

Duncan Matthews BSc (Hons)

Owner of Haye Farm.