

Further representations in the matters of Planning Applications SMD/2016/0378, SMD/2019/0646, SMD/2019/0716, SMD/2019/0725 (now withdrawn) and SMD/2022/0014.

Preface.

These comments arise from a careful reading of the description set out by the Case Officer on the 05/11/2019 this being the date she validated the (then) ' phased' parts of the proposed development.

On the 05/11/2019 and subsequently any phased developmental proposals were required to comply with the detailed conditions of the outline planning permission SMD/22016/0378 for the reasons set out in the notice of outline permission dated 26/10/2016.

Of specific current concern are how the current and on the record developmental proposed phased development fails to meet the conditions and reasons set out in the notice of outline permission with regard to condition 1. as to

- a) Layout,
- b) Scale,
- c) Appearance and
- d) Landscaping.

These conditions cannot be met for reasons set out below.

Environmental Concerns.

It is well established by statute and Case law that the phased development must be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. (see EIR's). Case law has emphasised that the proper and significant time to obtain and consider the Environmental Impact Assessment in a phased application is *at the time* when the impact of the phased development is to take place.

It is established on the record of the phased applications that the Applicants have (repeatedly) evidenced intentions to change it's plans for the phased stages so far revealed. These are in any event additionally incomplete.

It is a matter of grave concern that the Applicants plans, drawings, images etc evidence have moved increasingly away from the validated version submitted on the 05/11/2019. This movement away from the early intentions of the Applicants has become an ever moving target which has the effect of making difficulties for residents and environmental experts to keep track of consequential environmental impacts.

I submit that the phased applications are now of a *significantly different nature* as to no longer meet the description set out by the Case Officer on the 05/11/2019.

In the light of the recently obtained Wardell Armstrong Peer Reviewed (Stability) report of June 2022 it has become glaringly obvious that the vast majority of the plans, drawings, documents and reports *no longer have any validity* and cannot be corrected until the concerns expressed by Wardell Armstrong have been tested, measured and benefitted from engineering stabilisation mechanisms meeting current engineering standards. These will of course need to meet the ' new gold standards ' spoken about by Sir James Bevan in his speech on the 08/06/2022 entitled ' Serious business: why our environment is the ultimate investment '.

I have made detailed references to these aspects in my submission posted on the SMD/22019/0646 on....

Sadly for all residents and the wider world the " **scary stuff**" Sir Bevan predicted not only came to pass much earlier than he hoped (19/07/2022 & 20/07/2022) but was exceeded by new temperature levels which exceeded previous records by 2 degrees rather than the 1:5 degrees quoted in his report.

The consequences of factual planned changes to the Phased development at Moneystone Quarry(MQ).

It must now be clear to the SMDC LPA and the Case Officer and the Applicants that the combined issues of now proven instability at MQ, the repeated changes made by the applicants to their plans for the phased element of the development, the need for compliance with the new norms arising from Global Warming and Climate change and new Gold Standard Sir Bevan spoke about as recently as the 08/07/2022, the duty to comply with the core strategic policies of the SMDC LPA in its attempts to combat the effects of global warming and climate change simply cannot now be met.

These important new requirements make it clear that the MQ development is **no longer sustainable**.

All previously submitted documentation that purported to support the applications must now be provided anew and meet the current gold standards to meet the risks of climate change so very recently demonstrated by excessive temperatures.

Additionally the reports necessary as indicated by Wardell Armstrong report must themselves now meet new levels of engineering safety.

Until a completely new suite of reports covering all aspects of engineering safety measures and environmental standards are submitted by the Applicants to meet the current version of the Developers phased plans and (in the absence of any SMDC LPA in-house expertise) these reports and documents have also been peer reviewed it is self evidently the case that LPA will not be able to ' ensure that the MQ site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of all ground conditions and any risks arising from land stability and contamination.'

I invite the SMDC LPA to advise the residents and the wider public when it has required the Applicants to submit a new suite of planning documentation that meets current Environmental Impact Regulations and standards and additional reports that allows the LPA to properly discharge its duty to properly weigh the planning balance in respect of all the extant planning applications.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Housiaux.

22/07/2022.