

Jedi, McFarlands Down

St. Mary's IOS. TR210NS

Representation:

I have lived here for only 4 years. In the first 2 years of my living here there was virtually no noticeable activity at the 'quarry'. The road, McFarlands Down , was in poor but usable condition. Local residents all tell me there were years of complete inactivity and years of very occasional , once in a while low intensity activity.

This has changed dramatically in the last 2 years.

There has been a increase of activity since the publicly funded crusher arrived and Moorwell waste and Porthcressa materials were dumped at the 'quarry' illegally containing hazardous materials.

The access road, McFarlands Down, has been damaged to the point it has become unfit for public access .

Noise has been understated in the application.

Crushing activity can be heard at the golf club,

At my house at the top of the road and all the way to Tresco and Trenoweth flower farm depending on wind direction.

Based on the planning permission granted by the Environmental Agency to the operator of Pendrathen 'quarry' there would be an intense material increase in activity permitted that is not

Permitted in lawful use regulation.

Regards

Randolph Hensing

King, Andrew

Subject: FW: Form submission from: Planning application: P/15/088

SUBMITTED BY WEBFORM 26/10/2015:

Full Name: Randolph Hessing

E-Mail Address: PROVIDED

Your Address: Jedi, McFarlands Down, IOS TR210NS

Representation:

Further to my e-mail from a few days ago I would

Like to point out that the statements by Mr John Eyre, who was at the quarry once in 2009 in the time in Question as well as The statements by Ben Hicks and Brian Sanford are noticeably vague and contain no information as to quantity,

Location and use whatsoever.

It seems that whatever activities at the quarry there may have been that the planning consent from the Environmental Agency U1 and planning outlined in this application represent a huge material increase in activity and a change of use from a 'quarry' to a waste recycling and waste transfer site.

This represents a change of use and does not fulfill regulation governing 'lawful use'

King, Andrew

Subject: Pendrethen lawful use application

From: Randolph Hessing

Sent: 05 November 2015 15:50

To: Leijser,Theo; King, Andrew; Walton,Lisa; Dryden, Craig

Cc: mark.pilcher@environment-agency.gov.uk; steve.marshall@cecenvironment.co.uk

Subject: Pendrethen lawful use application

A few points to ponder.

The applicant has applied for lawful use to process specified materials at Pendrethen Quarry as waste transit processing site.

Whatever the activities were at Pendrethen Quarry over the last 10 years, they were certainly in breach of planning regulations.

The council and the Duchy who were aware of this did nothing about it.

The council refused to issue an enforcement order even after the debacle of large volumes of contaminated material from Moorwell and Porthcressa were dumped at Pendrethen Quarry in 2012. Since then there have been countless meetings, e-mails, letters and phone calls by Pendrethen residents and others with council representatives. These same council planning officers are now deciding over the lawful use by the applicant even though they have neglected to enforce planning regulation to this day in effect allowing the applicant to apply for lawful use. I believe this is a breach of the laws and regulation governing planning altogether and a neglect of duty by the officers responsible.

The applicant is in possession of a planning permit issued by the Environmental Agency to process 8000 tonnes of defined waste a year. Lawful use refers to specific activities in a 10 year period but also refers to the intensity of activities.

How many tonnes of waste (excluding contaminated waste) referred to in the application, were processed in the Quarry over the last 10 years per year on average?

There is no mention of that in the application.

As it is planned to process all specified waste at Pendrethen that used to go to Moorwell it would represent a material increase in intensity of activity.

The permits issued by the Environmental Agency by far exceed these activities especially when taking account of a U1 permit that would allow the applicant to process staggering amounts of waste including waste not previously processed at Pendrethen.

Changing the use of the Quarry into a waste processing transit site constitutes a change of use.

A change of use is not intended in a lawful use application.

For these reasons I doubt a lawful use arrangement applies and a planning application is necessary and reasonable considering the many inhabitants of this island affected by these plans.

Randolph Hessing

Jedi

McFarlands Down

IOS