

From: Karen Dalzell-Payne – Resident Paudy Lane:

I would very much appreciate it if the following comments could be read out in the planning meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of June 2023 in support of my objections to British Gypsum's planning application 2022/2260/02 (2022/VOCM/0161/LCC), that proposes: *"Variation of planning conditions no.8 and no. 10 of planning permission reference 2001/2001/2 to increase imports of gypsum and the associated numbers of HGV movements and a reduction in the permitted hours of importation"*

My comments/reasons are as follows:

- 1) **Barrow Works:** Since before the Barrow Works was built, British Gypsum have continually worked around Condition 34 of planning application 87/1467/2, which states "that the plant and buildings shall only be used for the production and manufacture of gypsum products from the Barrow Mine." This workaround is clearly evidenced by their continual submission of applications to extend the temporary permission that was given in 1992 to then import de-sulpha gypsum from the Drax Power Station by rail, and since Drax's closure, importing raw gypsum by road on the basis that they need to supplement the gypsum extracted from the Barrow Mine. It stretches belief that British Gypsum did not know when they submitted their original application for approval to build the Barrow Works that the quality of the gypsum that would be extracted from the Barrow Mine was not fit for purpose and would need to be supplemented.

I respectfully remind the council that Condition 34 was put in place to restrict the impact on the environment, the Residents and Local community, by ensuring that the Barrow Works could not be turned into a production plant for gypsum transported into the works from potentially anywhere in the world and would ask that British Gypsums application 2022/VOCM/0161/LCC is refused on the basis that it is in breach of Condition 34 of planning application 87/1467/2.

## 2) Cumulative Impact on the environment and local residents:

**I submit that the applications failure to accord to Policy DM11** on the basis that the cumulative impact upon the amenity of residential properties is not acceptable. Policy DM11 states: "that planning permission will be granted for minerals and waste development where it is demonstrated that cumulative impacts on the environment of an area or on the amenity of a local community, either in relation to the collective effect of different impacts of an individual proposal, or in relation to the effects of several developments occurring either concurrently or successively, are acceptable.

### Reasons:

- I. Before British Gypsum's arrival, Paudy Lane was a tranquil single-track rural road that although a through road to Barrow on Soar, saw at best 30 vehicle movements in a given day, and was used by the Quorn Hunt to exercise their hounds. Since the arrival of British Gypsum, the Quorn kennels have been relocated to Kirby Bellars, Paudy Lane is now 2 lanes, and the average vehicle movements have increased from circa 30 per day to in excess of 3,500 vehicles per day.

**I suggest that no one can be in any doubt that this is a very clear demonstration of the cumulative impact that British Gypsum's operation has had on the environment, the local residents and wildlife, since their arrival.**

**Karen Dalzell-Payne Comments re 2022/2260/02 (2022/VOCM/0161/LCC) - continued**

- II. Further, it is detrimental to the area in which I live through the accumulated impact of previous permissions, diminishing my amenity and enjoyment of the area through the increased emissions and the constant noise caused by the proposed increased of HGV movements, which if this latest application is granted would when consolidating all British Gypsum HGV movements associated with the site through Monday-Friday where operating hours are 7am-8pm, and Saturday where operating hours are 8am-2pm, equates to one lorry every 2 minutes.
- III. Does not take into consideration or offer mitigation for the “Reasons” referenced in 87/1467/2 and 2018/2588/02 & 2018/2589/02 which respectively state:
- IV. *10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 25, 26, & 33 - To safeguard the amenities of the area and to protect local residents in the surrounding area.*
  - a. *ii. 30) To safeguard the natural history interests of the area.*

**3) Speed Cameras:**

There is no disagreement that speeding has and one can assume always will be, a civil matter for the Police to administer. However, as a result of the “road improvements”. required to support British Gypsum’s operation the council’s officers including the current officer’s predecessor, have under the UK Governments Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) guidelines that define the responsibility of an organisation for the impact of its decisions on society, and the environment. Above and beyond its legal obligations, consistently included the condition that the applicant – British Gypsum, provide speed monitoring capability on Paudy Lane, including but not limited to Application # 2005/2313/02 Part II – Particulars of decision – Point 3.

While your officer advises that Condition 4 of planning permission 2001/2001/2, does not meet the relevant tests for planning conditions as set put in paragraph 55 of the NPFF, their recommendation to remove this condition, I suggest undermines your previous officer’s reasons for inclusion of this condition as a mechanism to focus British Gypsum on their Corporate Social Responsibility.

**4) Report Point 154:**

Your officer advises that a “revised set of planning conditions is proposed, which removes those conditions from the 2001 planning permission which are no longer relevant”, providing two examples.

**I respectfully suggest that in order for the Council to make an informed decision on this point, the officer provides a document that lists all of the conditions that are to be removed.**

Thank you for your time and consideration