

**Email of 27 January 2021 to Wakerley Quarry Liaison Group from John Gough,  
Planning Director, Mick George Ltd**

Dear All,

Further to the virtual Quarry Liaison Group meeting held on Monday there were a number of matters that were raised and the following provides the detail as offered:

a. **Revised monitoring regime**

The attached draft Scheme for Noise Monitoring is attached. This has been prepared by Les Jephson of LF Acoustics and seeks to update the previous scheme which although approved has been the cause of some criticism. The revised scheme introduces more regular monitoring with the inclusion of Barrowden within the locations to be monitored.

A plan is attached to this draft scheme showing the specific locations and if “Oak Farm” is not the correct name then an indication of the correct or preferred name would be appreciated.

This revised monitoring scheme additionally addresses the proposed activities prior to 7am (as discussed at point ‘d’ below).

a. **Noise monitoring results**

As discussed, periodic noise monitoring has been undertaken around the site and fundamentally no breaches of noise limits have been recorded. The most extensive noise monitoring exercise was that undertaken last summer which was run for a three week period to assess noise at the two nearest locations to the primary site activity at the time. This detail is attached although was widely circulated at the time. The summary conclusion of the accompanying (LF Acoustic) report states “*The results of the monitoring indicate typical ambient noise levels below the 45 dB LAeq noise limit during the survey period, when weather conditions were good. It is clear during the days when there were strong winds, the effect of the trees blowing in the woods clearly influenced the noise levels, increasing by up to 10 dB(A), with the quarry operations not audible during*

*these periods. Taking account of noise from activities at the property during the survey period, the results clearly indicate that the present operations generate acceptable levels of noise.*”

Historic noise monitoring has been undertaken in June 2017, October 2017, February 2018, October 2018, July and August 2019.

a. **Screening mound location**

The attached drawing indicates the approved location of the screening mounds around the southern periphery of the site. However this plan does not take account of the slight modification to the working scheme which delayed the working of the western most sector of Phase B which has meant that Bund 5 (west) would appear not to have been constructed but a temporary bund has been established generally perpendicular to it running in a general NNW direction (and that was shown in the aerial image and discussed).

To the east of Mound 5 (west) there was no bund proposed as the tree belt was to be retained (as the plan's notation indicates). However, although not required an additional topsoil mound has been established on the quarry side of the retained trees and that is in the region of 2 to 3m in height. Bund 5 (east) is not programmed to be constructed at this stage.

It is our considered opinion, that although not all of the mounds have been constructed as per the approved scheme alternative mounds have been established which have done a similar role as acoustic screens.

a. **Amended working hours**

Following the previous quarry Liaison Group meeting the Company proposed an amendment to the proposed working hour which sought to limit the quarrying activities to 6pm during the working week (as opposed to 7pm) and instead allow pre-loaded HGV's to leave the quarry. The proposal to allow maintenance of plant until 4pm on Saturdays would remain.

To demonstrate that this operation prior to 7am would not be intrusive it is proposed that for a three to four week period this would be allowed and the activity monitored (as noted in the revised noise monitoring scheme).

a. **Next meeting**

It is suggested that the next meeting takes place after the experimental period of allowing loaded HGV's to exit early. When details are known we will advise accordingly. Given the shortcomings of the Zoom meeting it is suggested this could be better dealt with by TEAMS. Mick George himself has confirmed a willingness to attend the next meeting although suggested there may be more benefit in that meeting being on site (as opposed to virtual).

Regards,

**John Gough**, Planning Director