

Further notes for Planning Inspector relating to Whitewall Quarry Site Visit– 14 March 2018

Travel, Amenities and Sustainability

W Clifford Watts (WCW) – Operations in North and East Yorkshire

W Clifford Watts (WCW) run a substantial number of quarries and concrete operations in the east part of North Yorkshire, and East Yorkshire to Hull.

According to their website (www.wcwatts.co.uk) W Clifford Watts operate

3 Quarries:

Whitewall Quarry – Jurassic limestone (crushed rock and agricultural lime) and Recycled Aggregates (CD&E) (North Yorkshire)

Gransmoor Quarry – Sand & Gravel and Recycled Aggregates (Driffield, East Yorkshire)

Park Farm Quarry – Sand & Gravel (Driffield, East Yorkshire)

6 Concrete locations:

Whitewall Quarry (North Yorkshire)

Hunmanby (North Yorkshire)

South Lane, Hull (East Yorkshire)

Selby (North Yorkshire)

Park Farm (East Yorkshire)

Freightliner Road, Hull (East Yorkshire)

Whitewall Quarry & Operations

Whitewall Quarry still has permission for mineral extraction to operate until November 2023, so 5 ½ years' of current planning permission. As can be seen when looking especially at the steep cliffs of the East boundary, the seam is getting deeper and deeper the further south the quarry goes, with ever increasing waste above it.

There are currently 4 separate operations at Whitewall Quarry: Quarrying of limestone by blasting; processing of limestone into crushed rock and agricultural lime; concrete batching; concrete panelling; CD&E waste transfer (approx. 8k tonnes a year, a very small operation relative to other sites in this area of North Yorkshire). Permissions for the other operations outside minerals extracting and processing, are aligned with this permission, since they were (misleadingly in the case of the concrete batching and concrete products) presented as “ancillary” operations, which they are not (discussed later in this document).

Employment

In their Design Access & Supporting Statements for the asphalt plant in 2012, and a storage barn for concrete products in 2013 (which was, oddly, never erected so permission now expired), WCW stated that they employed 80 people across all the sites (listed above) plus 11 FTEs at their head office. They also stated that beyond the Full Time Employees (FTEs), other HGVs are operated on a contract basis.

In those DA&S Statements WCW detailed Full Time Employees (FTEs) at Whitewall Quarry (presented here in table form for clarity). Our comments are in column 5.

	FTEs serving all WCW sites	FTEs serving Whitewall Site	FTEs driving vehicles based at Whitewall (transferable)	Comments
Head office	11			
Plant & Vehicle Fitters	2			
Whitewall Site Office		2 (Manager & Weighbridge operator?)	5	<i>All transferable over next 5 years</i>
Whitewall Mineral & CD&E Operations (excavators, dumpers, shovels, crushing, screening plant)		5		<i>All transferable over next 5 years, including potentially to new quarry site at Seamer</i>
Whitewall Concrete Batching		3		<i>All transferable to new concrete operations site eg. Norton Grove Industrial Estate</i>
Whitewall Concrete Products		5		<i>All transferable to new concrete operations site eg. Norton Grove Industrial Estate</i>

Seemingly, the concrete operation employs more FTEs than the quarrying and CD&E activities. The employment figures also suggest that Whitewall must be turning over a significant amount of concrete products and batching, and be highly profitable, to give full time employment to 8 people, and this does not tally with their claim of only 7 vehicle movements a day relating to concrete (which is discussed later in this document). The implication is that all these FTEs will be fully engaged in activities during the working day, which is commented on in the “Noise” section (later in document). All the concrete jobs would be transferable to a more suitable site (eg Norton Grove Industrial Estate); the quarrying operation jobs (in 5 ½ years’ time) can be transferred to other of their sites (noting they are applying for a new Sand/Gravel quarry site at Seamer just off the A64); and the driver jobs are with the vehicles again which would be transferable to other sites.

WCW’s claim that “25 jobs would be lost” if Whitewall Quarry was not granted further permission beyond 2023, is designed to be inflammatory, and inaccurate.

Economics

To produce a tonne of limestone is £3; plus aggregate tax £2 = £5 production costs/tonne (£100 production costs for a 20 tonne load)

Sell at £9 a tonne = £180 for 20 tonnes delivered to eg. Beverley (some 25 miles away). Assuming around £40 for the fuel/driver costs (conservative) this makes a profit of £40 on a 20 tonne load, not including wear and tear on vehicle and plant/machinery. In effect, the limestone quarrying is running on a high turnover of low quality (cheap) crushed rock sold with low margins, almost as a “loss leader” to facilitate the real “primary” function, the concrete operations at the site. Clearly this flies in the face of sustainability

Whitewall Quarry Asphalt Plant Application and Appeal – 2012-2015

In 2015, W Clifford Watts (WCW) lodged an appeal against NYCC for failure to determine an application for the siting of an asphalt plant in Whitewall Quarry. The Planning Inspector dismissed the Appeal. The reason the application went to appeal was because NYCC had repeatedly asked WCW for relevant information. WCW had either continually refused to supply the requested information, or NYCC had not been satisfied with the information provided, and its consistency and accuracy. This had resulted in considerable delay in the application being put to the Planning Committee (who considered it and rejected it in what had become an advisory capacity after the Appeal had been lodged).

The Planning Inspector for the Asphalt Appeal made a number of comments in the Appeal Decision (AD, with his Point numbers);

There is no limit on the number of vehicles entering or exiting the site.

“There is a very awkward junction at junction at Castlegate and Church Street.” (south of the level crossing) [the north end of Welham Road] (AD no. 5)

There is an AQMA at the centre of Malton (designated in 2009) (AD no. 5)

The PI also referred (in AD no.. 6) to the *“swathes of open rolling landscape to the south of Norton accommodating gallops and training grounds for racehorses, some of the most extensive being about 1-1.5km to the east along Langton Road. ... there are about 15 racehorses trainers operating at stables and yards within about 1.5km of the quarry, often from well-kept and sometimes Listed establishments. Indeed, it is clear from some of the Listing details that Norton has been associated with racehorse training for several centuries. I saw that investment in the business continues, recently upgrading the quality and durability of the gallops and expanding training operations, as evident in the additional stabling permitted at Spring Cottage Stables (13/00864/FUL).”*

Each of the 4 operations generates its own heavy traffic using different vehicles of different sizes going in different directions, mainly HGVs, eight wheelers, articulated lorries, tankers bringing in cement from Hull, concrete mixers, flat beds of different sizes, curtain siders, many of which are not under WCW’s control (for example with issues such as sheeting, speeding, alarms). If limits were to be imposed on this site, there would be particular practical difficulty to ensuring compliance with lorry routing arrangements.

“Nor would there always be any obvious way to distinguish between the vehicles used in connection with asphalt and those engaged on existing tasks.” (AD no. 36) and the same applies for the importation of materials for the 2 concrete operations and CD&E waste because the vehicles are sheeted.

“Routing arrangements are highly likely to attract the scrutiny of local people and, in the absence of some clear identification, elicit complaints that would require numerous investigations by the County

Council. I consider that a potential burden on the limited resources available to be unwarranted” (AD no. 36)

There is conflicting applicant information on WCW applications regarding HGV movements and directions; this may have contributed to the fact that there are no restrictions on numbers of HGV movements for any of the operations which would almost certainly be unenforceable, with an operator such as WCW who persistently seek to push boundaries, and too often only adhere to planning conditions and modify their operational behaviour, when challenged, which puts an unrealistic and unreasonable burden both on the local amenity, and the planning and enforcement officers who have a substantial number of sites to look after over a wide geography.

Control of imports and exports to/from Whitewall Quarry

While crushed rock and agricultural lime exports use the weighbridge, other vehicles entering and leaving the quarry are not included in this such as concrete mixers, concrete panel low loader transporters; CD&E waste; and any other purposes.

In 2015, tens of thousands of waste materials were imported through Whitewall Quarry and dumped on land to the south of the quarry, without being noticed by the authorities, proving just how difficult it is to monitor what is being imported.

Whitewall Quarry site has acted as a depot (creating further traffic through the AQMZ) for Type 1 roadstone, which WCW has admitted to. Despite assurances from WCW that there would be no further importation of Type 1, they continued to import it and when questioned again, WCW claimed that it was for an experiment for the production of concrete and would cease because it failed. This raised the question as to why it was necessary to import Type 1 roadstone (a much harder limestone from the Catterick area) if the material on site was available and suitable for the production of readymix concrete or concrete panels? The answer was, because the Whitewall limestone was not suitable, and too soft.

WCW then provided those documents to the Environment Agency, upon investigation, claiming that this what was being tipped on the area at the south of the site. The EA accepted this until it was pointed out the dates didn't cross reference and the nature of Type 1 roadstone. WCW were interviewed under formal caution, action was not taken as EA were unable to prove who dumped the waste. WCW claimed it must have been done by another party; but in fact it was the operator who brought the waste in through the quarry and went to considerable efforts to conceal it.

Concrete batching and concrete products (including panelling) at Whitewall

Concrete readymix requires aggregate with a minimum strength of 150 Kilonewtons. Whitewall limestone only has strength of 25-30 Kilonewtons. Carboniferous limestones (eg from Leyburn and the other side of North Yorkshire) are significantly stronger, and the dust from such limestone can be used in place of sand in concrete readymix.

There is no evidence that 30% of primary won aggregate goes into concrete manufacture despite what they claimed in the relevant planning application. WCW, rather than using indigenous Whitewall Limestone for the concrete batching and panelling (as they claimed in their application to justify “Ancillary” status), they are bringing in all the sand and gravel and aggregate from other sites (possibly including their own other locations), for concrete manufacture at Whitewall.

Where are the sand and gravel for concreting being imported from?

Where is the aggregate for concreting being imported from?

No firm evidence any CD&E waste goes into concrete manufacture. If waste is specifically imported to site for production on a back haul basis and demand for concrete exceeds supply of back-haul, then special trips would have to be made for primary won aggregate for the concrete manufacture from miles away

Concrete manufacture does not provide necessary support to the primary activities involved in the production of limestone, because the raw materials are not primarily produced from the quarry, sand, cement, gravel and water.

Policy SP6 of the local plan refers to alternative suitable sites. In this instance Norton Grove industrial estate with good access to the A64 both east and west directions would be a suitable alternative.

Manufacture of Concrete at Whitewall would conflict with policy SP9 as mainly (if not all) the materials being used in the manufacturing process are being imported from elsewhere.

The presence of recycled material, imported into the site, is used to justify the necessity of importing finite (sand and gravel) and manufactured (cement) resources over many miles.

There is no evidence that there is any lack of supply of anything from this site, and all the jobs are easily transferable if the concrete operation moved to the well located Norton Grove industrial estate, and the other local quarries may want to employ drivers.

Whitewall Quarry has become an industrial estate because the existing processes don't have an ancillary link to the mineral extraction.

WCW's claims that the concreting operations involve 7 concrete batch deliveries/day. This is highly unlikely given that there are 3 FTEs engaged in concrete batching with the 3 mixers based from Whitewall. If only 7 concrete mixer loads are going out a day, as well as visiting mixers, this does not add up to justify 3 FTEs for concrete batching. It is far more likely that there are significantly more concrete mixer loads leaving Whitewall Quarry than we are being told.

1 m³ of concrete requires 2.6 m³ of sand/gravel/cement/water. One cement mixer carries 16 tonnes of material. Therefore importing everything to the site, is far from sustainable, considering the traffic and noise problems that it causes.

Site monitoring reports at the Quarry do not refer to the composition and source of the concrete components, or its ancillary status, since this mentioned in the application, but not the planning permission given.

Sustainability – Crushed Rock

Closure of quarrying operations beyond that time will not impact the supply on crushed rock or agricultural lime because what is produced in Whitewall Quarry is not "Key Material" (such as silica sand or high quality and sought after building stone) and it has no significant mineral value. W Clifford Watts' claims about its value as building stone are overplayed (they do not have a single mention of supplying building stone anywhere on their website – just one mention of "walling stone" which would have a very limited application and could be sourced from many other quarries)

There are other Jurassic Limestone quarries already operating in North & East Yorkshire who can easily pick up the supply and which have capacity for many more years, and as they all produce higher quality Jurassic Limestone than that from Whitewall, they each advise that they can increase their output if the market demands it, should Whitewall close in 5 ½ years' time.

See the table on the next page for details of these quarries.

Greenwick Quarry already supplies substantial quantities to the Scarborough area.

NYCC have already explained about cross-fertilisation to supply the markets across the North and East Yorkshire boundaries

East Yorkshire CC maintain that they have substantial landbanks (“coming out of their ears” for limestone including Jurassic Limestone/crushed rock across their county including close to the NY border. They are unable to provide overall details because of commercial confidentiality but were emphatic about the point in general.

The Agricultural Lime market is seasonal as it has to be kept dry and spread in dry conditions. Spring (the first season) is often too wet for it to be spread, so the main time of year for lime is post-harvest during August/September.

Jurassic Limestone Quarries – crushed rock & agricultural lime

Quarry	Whitewall Quarry YO17 9EH	Settrington Quarry YO17 8NX	Wath Quarry YO62 4LT	Greenwick/ Huggate Quarries (East Yorks) YO42 1YR	Newbridge Quarry YO18 8JL
--------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	--	------------------------------

Distance from Whitewall Quarry		3.23 miles	8.62 miles	12.3 miles	10.7 miles
Location comments (Trunk Roads)	Current and previous planning applications state 82% travel north through Malton/Norton	Short distance (not through village) to B1248 to east; or north end of Settrington to A64: or B1248 to east Norton/ Brambling Fields to A64	On B1257	Just off A166	North to A171; 1 mile south (Pickering) to A170 / A169
Current annual output	180,000 tonnes	80,000 -120,000 tonnes	Only recently re-opened	Huggate – 30k tonnes Greenwick – 110k tonnes	165,000 tonnes
Potential annual output	Up to 250,000 tonnes	Much more	85,000 tonnes	Huggate – 40k tonnes Greenwick – 250k tonnes	250,000 tonnes
Current planning permission	150,000 tonnes/annum to November 2023	Can be extended to 2049	To October 2023		
Reserves	To November 2028	20-25 years	Substantial		
Comments		Higher quality crushed rock than Whitewall	Only recently re-opened and is not in the current MWJP so can now be included. Higher quality crushed rock than Whitewall	Huggate: High quality agricultural lime Greenwick: Jurassic Limestone – high quality chalky/flinty crushed rock. Supply substantial crushed rock to Scarborough and East Coast area Higher quality crushed rock and Ag Lime than Whitewall	Higher quality crushed rock than Whitewall. Best quality in the area – nearly Type 1 calibre.

There would be no impact on the 10 year landbank through to 2030 when Whitewall Quarry permission expires in 2023

Traffic

WCW have regularly provided underestimated information, for example of HGV movements. A recent example was from their first version of their planning application for an asphalt plant in 2012/13, when NYCC officers had to ask them to reconsider their HGV figures as they were materially inaccurate. It appears that WCW have downplayed vehicle movements consistently in the last 20 years in the applications they have made. An example is for the Readymix Concrete Batching delivery figures (7 loads a day) which have been discussed in the section on Concrete.

Substantially more HGV traffic is generated by the concrete manufacture and shipping in roadstone etc, and it is clear that there is a great deal more quarry HGV traffic than they account for when requested, as evidenced by NAG's traffic survey randomly picked on a normal working day (as previously submitted (Appendix E of Publication Response form Part B).

Because of the gradual growth in population there is an increasing amount of traffic on the road systems; rail services will be doubling from 2019 meaning twice as many barrier closings as there are now; the HGV restriction on the Level Crossing is imminent (and the Experimental Order is already in place although delayed due to snow delaying the erection of signage); junctions are at capacity and this cross-fertilises into amenity/AQMZ; and as the Planning Inspector who rejected the appeal for the installation of an asphalt plant (ruling in 2015) traffic generation is a general problem in Norton and Malton.

In 2015, the Planning Inspector for the Asphalt Plant Appeal, emphasised the sensitivity of Norton's commercial centre when commenting on the proposed increase in HGVs which would inevitably be routed up Welham Road and then to Commercial Street [via Church Street], and that *"it would add to the traffic already traversing these streets and increase the incidence of HGVs there, so further denuding the quality of Norton's commercial centre. This would not contribute to the vitality, viability and attractiveness of Norton, or enhance public areas or reflect the aim of instigating traffic management measures to improve the pedestrian experience in the town. On the contrary, this would exacerbate the presence of HGVs, so undermining an aim of the [Local] Plan to create an inviting appearance in Commercial Street to attract and retain custom and to counteract those signs that the place risks falling into decline. As such, the routing arrangements proposed would undermine the aims of policy SP7."* (AD no. 37)

WCW comment that they contributed to the Brambling Fields junction and therefore feel entitled to use Commercial Street as much as they can. In fact, their "contribution" was by way of a Section 106 and amounted to £20,000, a fraction of the approximately £5m cost of the junction. They have therefore been benefiting from this for some time, and since they pay relatively small business rates (£35,000) for the quarrying operations (and none relating to the concreting operations), their Section 106 contribution would barely match a year's Business Rates for a concrete operation in an appropriate site on an industrial estate which might be around £20-25k a year (as per Cemex on Showfield Lane Industrial Estate, Malton). Avoiding these Business Rates has meant that £300,000-£375,000 has not been paid in Business Rates for those concrete operations over the last 15 years since commencement.

Direction of Traffic

In their Design Access & Supporting Statement for installing an asphalt production plant in 2012 WCW stated on page 15:

"As with previous applications for aggregates supply, concrete batching and concrete products, the anticipated distributions of the Asphalt Plant product will be about 82% to the North Yorkshire and 18% to East Yorkshire."

This is consistent with previous applications for their various operations. It does not therefore indicate that their current claim of 40% “North” and 60% “south (direction East Yorkshire) is accurate.

As per the Experimental Order as advised, the Level Crossing between Norton and Malton will have an 18 month 7.5 tonne HGV restriction. NYCC have demonstrated that by imposing a ban on OGV1 and OGV2 vehicles, there will be a significant reduction in NOx, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions, at all traffic speeds from 16KPH to 48KPH, in all three critical roads: Castlegate (Malton), Norton Road (Malton) (known as Blackboards, which goes from the LX to Malton Station), and Church Street (Norton), and using the assumption that each OGV1 and OGV2 would be replaced by 2.3 cars. One factor that has not been accounted for is that the “*about 82%*” of OGV1 and OGV2s going to/from Whitewall Quarry, will no longer split between the Level Crossing and Church St/Commercial Street – they will all travel along Church St/Commercial Street to Brambling Fields. Since 1:3 of the OGV1 and OGV2 vehicles at the top of Welham Road is Quarry-related, this is significant.

Over the last 2 years, and because of the significant traffic congestion, AQMZ, flooding leading to protracted road repairs, County Bridge repairs for example, and the plan to introduce the HGV restriction on the Level Crossing, there have been regular and significant traffic monitoring episodes (with rubber bands across several roads in the area to assess the traffic, for weeks at a time), on behalf of Highways, and Network Rail. It is noticeable that when there is monitoring, WCW adjust their routing, and tend to send their vehicles on other routes. The “shortcut” to the A64 through Kirkham is no long possible (as there is a 13 tonne weight restriction on that bridge). Langton village has a primary school on the road through the village and using this route has caused much distress and concern there. They claim that most vehicles go south towards Stamford Bridge, which might suit true east-bound traffic but is hardly sustainable for deliveries looking for the A64 and going north.

Sustainability and future markets

There is a suggestion that at the current rate of extraction, WCW will not have extracted the extent of the current permission by 2023. Indications are that the market for Whitewall’s crushed rock is diminishing with its quality, and that other Jurassic limestone and crushed rock quarries are being chosen as sources for this reason. There is no reason to expect an upsurge in demand for Whitewall’s crushed rock for this reason. Even selling it at rock bottom prices (and making money on the transportation, in effect becoming a haulier of the lowest quality soft stone) is not sustainable if people become fed up of having to re-order or replace it more and more frequently (for example in farm gates) and opting for better quality product. This business plan in itself flies in the face of sustainability; never mind the irreversible damage done to the secondary aquifer of Whitewall Hill, in its important position above Norton and so close to the Derwent (as already discussed).

The belief is that the quarrying is becoming more and more a support for the real “future” business plan which is the concrete operations, which is expanding in its inappropriate site and under the false assertion that it was “ancillary” to the quarrying operation.

The profits are in the concrete business, and they want a 20 year promise so they can invest in the downstream products and in effect turn the quarry floor and site into a B2 industrial estate – the asphalt plant plan was part of that aim, as was the concrete block manufacturing operation, and the CD&E waste (and indeed proposed household waste centre which was also deemed non-preferred by NYCC).

Amenity

Please see references to Amenity in letter of 14 January 2016; Publication Response Form Part B; and letter of 11 February 2018, including impact on racing businesses and proximity of Whitewall Quarry to the two sets of gallops; and the general impacts.

As advised, the Level Crossing is now subject to an Experimental Order for prohibition of HGVs for a period of 18 months (the crossing and County Bridge are closed overnight during this week for crossing light improvements and the erection of signage relating to this Experimental Order).

Very little restoration has been done and it is not being done on an incremental basis which it was meant to, and this has been a source of ongoing grievance and time-consuming with the planning officials. This lack of progress has contributed to the ongoing problem of dust particularly in the area downwind of the prevailing s/w wind, and on the Whitewall Hill verges and road.

Noise

In para 5 of Planning Practice Guidance it sets out guidelines on how to recognise when noise should be a concern. Increase in noise may cause a change in someone's behaviour to their surroundings. Intensification of activities at Whitewall Quarry have changed people's behaviour.

The Planning Inspector for the asphalt application appeal (paras 28 and 29) concluded that as an asphalt operation would not be ancillary, it would be *"more akin to a new industrial process within the quarry and as such, it would more naturally be subject to a noise assessment designed to measure the effects of industrial processes and fixed installations, namely BS4142:1997."* Since the concrete manufacturing operations are also *"more akin to a new industrial process within the quarry"* this should also apply to them. It is impossible to monitor separately.

In para 34 the Planning Inspector referred to increasing HGV and associated quarry traffic increasing the noise, it would result a noticeable denudation in their living conditions of those in the Welham Road area. At the time of the asphalt plant application, a significant number of residents in the Welham Road area, wrote to the Council expressing their concern at the already substantial denudation in their living conditions, caused by the HGVs close to their properties. Empty trucks are particularly noisy when they climb Welham Road and Whitewall Hill, and when they shudder across the quarry floor.

Another factor that plays a part, is the number of operations in the quarry happening at the same time, such as when a number of processing operations are happening simultaneously as well as loading, and also in the concrete products area (such as cutting blocks with chainsaws, and breaking up waste concrete). The noise can be truly awful and because of the ever increasing size of the quarry, this magnifies also. The noise bunds at the north end prove little use to quarrying operations further south in the quarry, because the noise travels over them because of the vast size and depth of the crater.

Since we moved here in 2001, there has been a significant increase in HGV traffic, and noise, and in particular in the last 10 or so years with the expansion of the concrete panelling/products operation. Until then, the racehorse trainers from the west side of Norton were able to ride their racehorse strings to the gallops at both Highfield and Langton Road. Now, those racing yards have to box up their horses, which of course restricts the number of horses they can train at a time so has a direct economic impact on those businesses. WCW routinely used the completely unsuitable

Whitewall/Bazleys Lane as an HGV route, until the 7.5 tonne weight restriction was imposed, which means we can still hack to the gallops, thankfully.

NYCC have attempted to address the noise problem – the planning permissions as they stand, refer to “10dB above background” for the operations (collectively) within the quarry, taken at any noise sensitive location. However, they never measured background at the time. There have been 3 separate surveys conducted, each one conflicts. These noise monitoring exercises have also demonstrated how vulnerable they are to manipulation, and that it is not possible to do unless the quarry is entirely closed, which the operator refused to do. We invested in noise monitoring equipment and conducted collection of background noise data, taken over the Christmas period when the quarry was closed (but in all other respects were normal working days, not bank holidays); and the data collected was consistent with data from one of the 3 surveys referred to above. NYCC how have this information. The background noise level is 30.5dB. The surveys undertaken, and my own data, demonstrate also that during normal operations, noise levels are around 30dB above background (on average, and does not account for the considerably higher impulsive noise that we are subjected to). This data has been supplied to NYCC and we understand that it has been forwarded to you.

Dust and Spillage

Dust continues to be and remains an ongoing problem – on the verges, on the roads, and blowing in particularly with the generally prevailing SW wind, which is an issue for properties in that direction. WCW make efforts to clean the roads when there is an inspection due (the road cleaner was on the highway at Whitewall Hill yesterday, 13 March 2018). NYCC have numerous photographs of the usual state of Whitewall Hill.

Only today – 14 March 2018 – one of WCW’s concrete mixers has left a trail of concrete down Whitewall Hill and Welham Road, and Wheelgate (the main high street) in Malton. Clearly this had to be cleaned up – see photograph over the page.



Blasting

NYCC are reliant on the operator to provide information on blasting. They are unable to monitor this independently. The impulsive nature of blasting, and noise and vibration and fracturing = loss of amenity. For a short period of time NYCC endeavoured to warn residents of blasting but they then advised they are no longer able to do this due to lack of resources. Blasting is therefore self-policing, and with an unreliable operator clearly this is not satisfactory.

Speeding

Over many decades speeding has been raised as an issue related to the Quarry, and attempts have been made to address this, numerous times over the years, by local councillors and Norton Town Council. More recently, Welham Road has been regularly served by NY Police with their speed monitoring equipment, and not surprisingly this has been effective for the time being.

The suitability for so many HGVs in the heavily pedestrianised roads in Norton (and Malton), continues to be a huge amenity risk. HGVs take at least 3 times as long to brake as a car, at the same speed, and therefore continue to be a huge risk to pedestrians, especially mothers with pushchairs, small children, old people, school children, and everyone else who need to cross Welham Road, Church Street, Commercial Street, in particular on foot, including walking to/from the train and bus stations, the Lidl supermarket in Welham Road, the Derwent swimming pool and fitness centre in Church Street, and the local shops in Commercial Street, and Norton Primary School (including its just-opened expansion site in Langton Road); and Norton College also in Langton Road. The various mini roundabouts, and pedestrian crossings, are all risk points, as are the risks for people getting in and out of their cars in Commercial Street to access the local shops or to go in and out of their houses. These concerns of course apply to any HGVs or any highly pedestrianised towns or residential areas.

Building stone – further points

Whitewall Quarry stone is unsuitable for building. WC Watts do not even advertise that they supply building stone on their website, so attempts to portray Whitewall Quarry as an important source of it are misleading. Since they blast in the quarry, which fractures, this renders the quarry product even more unsuitable, as has been ascertained. They have never once mentioned in any application, or any returns, that they supply building stone.

Fitzwilliam Estates who own many older commercial properties in Malton, that might be considered to be possible clients for building stone for repair and restoration should it be suitable. They do not use Whitewall Quarry as a source for stone to repair their properties, because the stone is unsuitable.

WCW claimed that they have sold 4k tonnes to Drings, and that they come “once a week” to collect his building stone. They are therefore claiming that Drings collect about 80 tonnes a week (which would require 4 x 20 tonne HGVs each week). This is clearly a great exaggeration and not consistent with Dring’s comments on the quality of the stone, tendency to erode, and change colour. Their support for Whitewall stone is limited to a preference to be able to have some access to fresh pieces where colour match is important for bespoke pieces where colour is the primary importance over quality (while conceding that it changes colour quickly). It is highly likely such pieces would be available from other quarries. Many estates in this east side of North Yorkshire, quarry their own stone from their own land for repair to their own buildings, and use recycled stone from their own buildings within the area.