

APP/M1900/W/21/3278097
WITNESS STATEMENT

**Cumulative Impact and Unrealistic Timescales significant to
The proposed quarrying activity at the Hatfield Aerodrome**

By:	Craig Tallents - Chair of Smallford Residents Association
Date:	17 October, 2021
Use:	Appeal APP/M1900/W/21/3278097 (Nov. 2021) on rejection of proposed quarrying activity, Hatfield Aerodrome
Witness called by:	Ellenbrook Area Residents Association (EARA) and Smallford Residents Associations (SRA)

Cumulative Impact and Unrealistic Timescales (Paragraph 4.3 of ERA and SRA Statement of Case)

1. Quarrying has been part and parcel of life for the residents of Ellenbrook and Smallford since at least the 1930s and there is evidence that it was going on here before that. Throughout these decades we have been told that the quarrying is both temporary and reasonable. I will leave it up to your own judgement to decide if at least 90 years is temporary and indeed reasonable.
2. We are now faced with further decades of quarrying complete with the accompanying traffic, noise pollution and more importantly dust pollution. All this quarrying will have impacted our health.
3. We have studied the proposed methodology to be adopted in working this proposed quarry and note with interest that the timescale suggested is some 32 years, neither temporary nor reasonable I suggest.
4. When the application was first submitted by Brett Aggregates it was thought that the Hatfield Quarry operated by CEMEX would cease its operations before this new quarry was in production. Unfortunately, this is not the case and CEMEX has had its operation extended as it seeks to remove minerals from the Stanborough area to the north of the application site. This extension is for at least another ten years. This appears when considered with the Brett application to be neither temporary nor reasonable.
5. As I mention above, we have studied in some details the timescale proposed and note that the application proposes 32 years, but we would question this assumption as in our view the period quoted does not allow for the revised ground water management plan submitted by Brett. This new plan requires a new method of working and by our estimates the 32 years is more like 38 which when allowing a further 3 -10 years for the landscape to recover equates to some 40 to 50 years, neither temporary nor reasonable.

This assumes that Brett will be quarrying at full capacity though we do note that Brett mentions fluctuations in demand which may slow the extraction process. So, are we talking 40 years, 50 years, or 60 years? Whichever is the answer it is neither temporary nor reasonable and it is disingenuous to suggest it is so. What is evident is that all of us here and involved in this discussion will not

be around to see the end of the quarry, neither temporary nor reasonable.

6. We also question the supposition constantly advanced that the minerals are needed and thus the quarry is a necessity. By admitting to fluctuations, it suggests that the need cannot be predicted and as such we question why our area with a fully functioning quarry in production for the next ten years at least, needs another quarry and more importantly another processing hub, located some 400m from the existing one. The cumulative impact of two quarry processing hubs co located is neither temporary nor reasonable.
7. Arguing in favour of the quarry and the application Brett give the fact that other quarries have been operating in Hertfordshire on long time scales to in effect justify the timescale they propose. This is not a reason for granting this application in fact it does the opposite it recognises that the quarry will blight the landscape and the lives of those living locally for decades to come.
8. We now turn to the management of the bromate plume and the impact that a discovery of this on site will have on timescales. They will go one way; they will be lengthened as digging ceases to allow for investigation and then safe management. This will mean a 'no go' area. Also, as someone who operates in the corporate strategy arena, I know the outcome of such a discovery. The risk will be assessed and if that risk primarily in financial terms is too big the operation will cease, the corporate structure running the quarry will be placed in liquidation and the taxpayer will be faced with a clean-up bill running into millions of pounds, neither temporary nor reasonable. I would ask that if minded to approve the quarry that conditions are attached to the approval which negate this burden on the taxpayer committed to both by Brett and indeed the landowner.
9. The estimate of 32 years which by their own figures could be 42 years without demand fluctuations and indeed bromate issues is I am afraid too long and its impact on the lives of those who live locally will be devastating.

It is neither temporary nor reasonable.