
Begin forwarded message:

From: Sheila Walters
Subject: **Objection to the claim of no significant Environmental change or effects**
Date: 9 January 2025 at 11:03:58 GMT
To: Jane Curley



Dear Mrs Curley ,

We have noted that the Supporting Planning Statement: Moneystone Quarry – Phase 2 that was submitted in October 2023 contains this conclusion

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

This is clearly without foundation as we have pointed out to you that a number of environmental changes have taken place since pre 2014 when the report was originally compiled; eg the climate crisis and new SMDC policy towards combatting it and new national environmental regulations and legal judgements and precedents.

All of these make a nonsense of such a statement of conformity and in particular one that has no substantive evidence to back it up.

However we note that in your report to the PAC in 2023 on a RMA application SMD/2019/0646 you accepted it without question.

Presumably having also accepted it also in the validation of the current RMA application SMD/2023/ 0532, you have continue to adhere to the same line contrary to evidence produced by the reports of Wardle Armstrong that you commissioned for 0646 over (inter alia)stability issues, changes to the status of the quarry 3 lagoon in that same application to being classified as a reservoir on the basis new evidence brought by an independent report by Binnies on behalf of the EA who have now changed their mind as a result; changes to the water levels of the lagoon by illicit and unauthorised engineering works by Abbeydale BEC without planning permission; damage to the earth bund and the willful destruction of the existing overflow safety system which SMDC have acknowledged happened but took no action as a result .

It is an ongoing set of contradictory actions that belie the truth of the conformity statement .

Added to which you now seem to have accepted a further set of assessments that have not been commented upon the Statutory Consultees having been added well beyond the validation date of the application.

We are therefore objecting to the application based upon the actuality of the situation at MQ and the recent site history.

Yours sincerely,

David Walters
Secretary
Churnet Valley Conservation Society
CVCS