

## Joan Jackson

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 31 August 2024 17:46  
**To:** Joan Jackson; Planning Control  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Gayles Quarry NY/2022/0103/FUL

Dear Joan,

31 August 2024

We are writing in response to the revised version of the noise analysis (revision date 26<sup>th</sup> March 2024). We recognise that the consultants have made some additions to the document to address some of the comments that have been made by the campaign team and the council environmental health officer. However, there are still issues with this report as we set out below.

1. [Section 3.1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph]: The consultants state that “both heavy/tracked vehicles are regularly used”. This is simply untrue, and it should be removed from the report, so as to avoid misleading anyone who may read the report and not know the truth.
2. [Section 3.1, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph]: The consultants make comments about the absence of reflective surfaces due to the nature of the quarrying method and sound absorption due to spoil heaps. This seems highly speculative as they have no idea how the quarry will develop, how the stone will come out of the ground or where the spoil heaps will be positioned. They go on to say that the potential for reflection can be mitigated by the location of spoil heaps and the orientation/location of plant and vehicles. Can the applicant then please confirm that *they will mitigate* sound reflections *by continually assessing* where best to place the spoil heaps? If they are not willing to confirm that this mitigation will take place, then these speculative comments should be removed from the document.
3. [Section 3.6, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph]: The consultants state that the distance of the quarrying and ancillary processes will, over time, increase in distance from Quarry House. Again, can the applicant confirm that all machinery and processes will move as the quarrying proceeds? Even with this, traffic movements will continue to use the same route to access the quarry so this sound will remain constant.
4. [Section 3.6, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph]: In a technical document of this type, it is standard professional practice that one consultant will prepare the document and then before publication a second consultant will perform a detailed review of the document to make sure it is accurate. This is the case with this document as can be seen on the front page, where it states it was prepared by MS Tunstall and checked by AH Young. We noted previously that this checking was lacking and here again we have a paragraph that reads “The noise levels used in”. Even the most cursory of checks should have spotted this incomplete sentence. Yet again, this demonstrates that these consultants are not working to a professional standard and if they can’t manage to complete their sentences, how are we to trust their calculations?
5. [Unlabelled table on page 11]: The value for the property “Distance attenuation for on-site activity including crushing and HGV movement” has been changed from 42 d(BA) to 26 d(BA). It was 42 d(BA) in the original (15<sup>th</sup> February 2022) version and the second version (11<sup>th</sup> April 2023), but in this version (26<sup>th</sup> March 2024) it is 26 d(BA). There is no explanation for this change provided, which number is correct? And how can that be trusted?
6. [Unlabelled table on page 11]: The value for the property “Distance attenuation” has been changed from 39 d(A) to 47 d(A). It was 39 d(A) in the original (15<sup>th</sup> February 2022) version and

the second version (11<sup>th</sup> April 2023), but in this version (26<sup>th</sup> March 2024) it is 47 d(A). There is no explanation for this change provided, which number is correct? And how can that be trusted? Also please note that the units for this are d(A), whereas in 5 above they are d(BA), even though they are numbers for an identical quantity – this should be consistent.

7. [Unlabelled table on page 11]: The value for the property “Activity continuous for crushing and screening with other operations on-going” changed from 100% to 80%. Again, no explanation, which gives cause for both concern and doubt.

8. [Table 3.7.1, First column]: The number has changed from 42 to 40. It was 42 in the original (15<sup>th</sup> February 2022) version and the second version (11<sup>th</sup> April 2023), but in this version (26<sup>th</sup> March 2024) it is 40. There is no explanation for this change provided, which number is correct? And how can that be trusted?

9. Appendix 1: The consultants have added appendix 1, which appears to be an attempt to provide the workings for how they arrived at the numbers they did. It fails in its purpose because Step 1 has no value provided and it uses numbers that have been changed as described above.

In summary, it is clear that the consultants feel free to make assertions that are simply not correct (tracked vehicles) and modify their numbers from one document to the next without feeling the need to explain the reason for these (in some cases massive e.g.: 87dB to 36dB) changes.

As a professionally produced document, it gives serious cause for concern both in its content and execution. The doubts highlighted would suggest an independent noise survey might be better placed to give an unbiased and accurate prediction.

Please would you register this as a further objection.

Kind regards,