

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
Attn: Michael Joyce, case officer
Our ref. PS/Stowey Quarry
Your ref. APP/F0114/A/13/2195706
By e-mail. teamp16@pins.gsi.gov.uk
13 th August 2013

Dear Sirs

Appeal ref. APP/F0114/A/13/2195706, Stowey quarry

Inquiry - 3-5 September 2013

We have this afternoon read the Council's letter to you dated 13th August 2013. Further to our previous correspondence we maintain that there would be an unacceptable degree of risk posed by landfilling this site, even if the proposals were to be amended to limited to inert waste and asbestos.

In April 2012 the EA stated in their consultation response to BANES:

"If the development can be constructed as described and there are no sensitive receiving waters as described, then any such landfill at this location would not contravene the terms of the Agency Landfill Location Policy. The essential elements of the development with regard to the policy are that the landfill is not leachate producing and hence would not potentially require long term site management including leachate and groundwater control. Further, the development is constructed above the groundwater and would have the benefit of an unsaturated zone in which leachate attenuation could occur, thereby mitigating the risks to offsite surface and groundwaters. Leachate generation within landfill sites which are partially, temporally or permanently below the water table can be significantly enhanced by groundwater ingress" [our underline].

It is clear from the Appellants recently submitted HRA and the EA's response to this that they both accept that there are indeed sensitive receiving waters, and that there is no proven unsaturated zone in which leachate attenuation will occur.

Therefore landfilling with inert waste and asbestos would still contravene the Landfill Location Policy in that groundwater ingress will enhance leachate generation, that leachate will include asbestos fibres and there are sensitive receptors within influencing distance.

We would like to reiterate that should the Inspector agree to amend the Appeal as requested by the Appellant this would deny and deprive hundreds of local residents and many other interested Parties, their opportunity to be consulted and have the opportunity of seeking expert advice in order to engage with full and proper discussion.

We, and the independent experts, find the Environment Agency letter of 6th August 2013, sent to the Appellant and copied to PINS, unclear and possibly contradictory with previous Environment Agency correspondence. This is a further reason that we feel the application should be considered afresh by all Parties through the Planning Process so that there would be an opportunity to have further expert analysis and

discussion with the Environment Agency.
Sally Monkhouse
Chair Stowey Sutton Action Group