

**NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE  
EXAMINATION 29<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2016**

STATEMENT BY DAVID ADAMS OF THE COACH HOUSE, PASSENHAM, MK19 6DH

MY STATEMENT REFERS TO MATTER 4, ISSUES 1 and 2 OF THE INSPECTOR'S DRAFT MATTERS AND ISSUES PAPER ANF IN PARTICULAR SITE M6 PASSENHAM EXTENSION EAST.

I intend to show that the plan is ineffective in being able to control the impact of quarrying at site M6, Passenheim East and therefore is unsound.

Firstly, air quality is referred to on page 66 in document 402, Technical appendix. This section refers to wind blow but omits to mention the prevailing wind direction, which is South West, Passenheim is directly downwind of the extraction site. The paragraph goes on to suggest that a distance of 110m, a mature tree belt and unspecified methods of mitigation are sufficient to prevent dust becoming a significant problem.

I contend that a distance of 110m is far too close for dust to be insignificant in terms of the health of the residents of Passenheim, the tree belt has large gaps in it and being mature, the canopy is not at ground level, therefore the dust will blow straight through the tree line.

The unspecified, appropriate mitigation measures, we assume, will be water spray related. The existing quarrying at Passenheim relies on spraying water on the haul road but in very hot weather this has been shown to be ineffective and we notice our cars are regularly covered in dust.

The list of the sources of dust emissions does not include the infilling of the quarry, which we have found in the past to be the major cause of dust generation. I note that a detailed assessment is not required. In view of the above, I feel that this is a major omission and shows that the health and wellbeing of Passenheim residents is not being given proper consideration.

Continued.

Secondly, Noise and vibration are referred to on page 67 in document 402, Technical appendix.

All of my comments on Dust can equally be attributed to noise. Again, the mitigation measures are not specified. The usual method of noise attenuation is by earth bunds but in this instance the Environment agency have stipulated that no bunds are to be placed in the flood plain, therefore I can see no way that the residents of Passenham can be protected from noise throughout the working week. Even the Council agree that after taking into account their flawed mitigation measures, there would be a moderate adverse impact but the significance of these levels, would only be considered at planning application stage. This is too important to be left to this late stage and should be properly considered now.

This brings us to Issue 2, I believe that I have demonstrated the lack of detailed mitigation measures in the plan. Details of mitigation measures should be included in the plan so that they can be challenged to ensure they comply with national policy.