
From: SheilaWalters
Sent: 27 December 2023 23:59
To: Planning (SMDC)
Cc: Curley, Jane
Subject: A False Statement of EIA Conformity /Objection to applicationSMD/2023/0532

Categories:

Dear Mrs Curley,

A False Statement of EIA Conformity /Objection to applicationSMD/2023/0532

On the question of the validation of application **SMD/2023/0532** which you have deemed as having 'no issue raised' in your earlier correspondence to me, it would seem to be an opportune moment to remind you of the national planning guidance which states that if an application form is incorrect then the application is invalid.

If you examine the details on the application form that accompanied the above application to SMDC which was received on the 24th October and 'validated' after the 16th November, they are factually incorrect.

The EIA statement of conformity submitted by Asteer Planning for the Phase 2 Reserved Matters Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire

on behalf of Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited October 2023 states under the heading **Current Site Conditions**

" 3.6 With the exception of the ongoing restoration works on site and the Moneystone Solar Farm, which has been constructed and is now operational, there have been no further site development related activities undertaken at the site since planning permission was granted in 2016.

3.7 Overall, there have been no material changes to the site description chapter presented in the 2016 ES. "

That is a false and misleading statement repeated elsewhere in the documentation.

For example here in the extract from the Support Planning Statement also submitted by Asteer Planning in October 2023 as underlined below in red

- 1.5 This SPS is intended to address the planning considerations relevant to the determination of the reserved matters application. It considers the leisure development in light of local and national planning policy and assesses its compatibility in planning terms.
- 1.6 The outline planning application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement ("ES").
This reserved matters application is accompanied by an ES Statement of Conformity which confirms that the 2016 ES is considered to be valid for the purposes of decision

1

Supporting Planning Statement: Moneystone Quarry – Phase 2

October 2023

making in respect of the Phase 2 reserved matters application, and no new significant environmental effects have been identified.

Unfortunately 2 incidents are on record whereby new, significant environmental effects took place via further site development related activities undertaken at the site since planning permission was granted in 2016.

In 2016 Staffordshire County Council had to issue a Stopping Order to curtail excavations and dumping of tonnes of illicit waste material by contractors acting on behalf Laver Leisure who were attempting to construct a land bridge across quarry 2 following the grant of outline permission. The dumped material remains on site and is now in an unspecified condition but was known to contain numerous toxic materials identified at the time under laboratory conditions.

In 2021 further illegal excavations were carried out by contractors Abbeydale BEC, agents of Laver Leisure without the required LPA consents or permission from the Environment Agency in quarry 3. There were no environmental checks, no permission to alter the level of the overflow by destroying the existing emergency system, no archaeological inspection, no agreed variation of the 2014 Restoration Plan with SCC which required the area to be left unaltered and which was also subject to a protective buffer zone provision/agreement between the lagoon at the quarry edge and the SSSIs immediately adjacent. Likewise Natural England and Staffordshire Wildlife were not consulted.

The latter incident was also reported SMDC who should have enforced remediation but to this day the site remains open to the elements and with no emergency overflow intact.

The fact that the applicant's agents deliberately carried out the breaches of planning protocol and in full knowledge of those unauthorised actions still continue to deliberately promote the myth that there have been no further site development related activities undertaken at the site since planning permission was granted in 2016, underlines the reason you should reject the application on the grounds that it is palpably proven to be untrue, inaccurate and untrustworthy as a statement of conformity.

I should be grateful therefore learn what immediate action you propose to take in the light of the evidence presented here and in the meantime please register this as an objection to the application.

Yours sincerely,

David Walters