Rivington Against Greenbelt Exploitation
RAGE

Public Meeting

June 29th 2011
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Background
3. Montcliffe Extension Application
4. What do we want?
5. What can we do?
   • Judicial Review update
6. We need your help!
Introductions

- First RAGE Meeting?
- Press
- Council Officials
- Me – Marcus Simmons
- BHEAG - Blackrod & Horwich Environmental Action Group
- RAGE - Rivington Against Greenbelt Exploitation

www.RivingtonRage.org

- Thanks to all who have chosen to get involved
Stone to be removed between 2 quarries

Potentially Contaminated & Unstable Buttress

APPROVED Pilkington 2 Quarry (JR)

Montcliffe to be used for huge ‘recycling facility’

Pilkington to be used for dumping material that can’t be recycled
Background - Armstrongs

• Montcliffe and Pilkington Quarries are both operated by Armstrongs
  • We are not fighting Armstrongs – we are fighting over-development in greenbelt
  • Obvious concerns (fires, smells, fines) not relevant to planning
  • Recent Environmental conviction may be relevant to planning (appeal 11\textsuperscript{th} July)

• Create a huge, ongoing ‘recycling’ and waste tip facility

• Cannot be achieved in one planning permission
  • Over-development in green belt
  • Smaller step by step planning applications used instead
Background – Bolton Council

Do Bolton Council have an interest in Moncliffe Quarry outcome?

If so, OK, but should declare interest & should not impact scrutiny of applications

Montcliffe – in October 2007 Bolton Council stated:

“The Council receives a share of the mineral extraction royalty rights from the operator of this working quarry.”

“the council would attempt to maintain an income stream after quarrying ceased”

This is just 1 year after agreeing the last Montcliffe extension & making promises that it would close in 2011 & be restored by 2012!

In November 2009 Bolton Council stated it would:

“discuss with Armstrong’s a strategic relocation of recycling operations from Horwich Loco to Montcliffe Quarry.”

We want Bolton Council to come clean on their interest & plans for Montcliffe
In 2009 Bolton Council agreed a ‘restoration plan’ for Pilkington Quarry for around 4.6 Million tonnes of waste!

- Adds about 470,000 HGV movements to the local road network, 2.4 times the traffic currently proposed by the Montcliffe proposal.
- Agreement made without public consultation.
  - Only found out due to evidence submitted to Armstrongs appeal of their planning refusal in 2009
  - Pilkington restoration is on hold due to Environment Agency concerns over potentially contaminated material already in the quarry & impact on water
- Could the same type of ‘restoration plan’ be made for Montcliffe some years after the current application is agreed?
Montcliffe Quarry

- Armstrongs have applied to continue extracting until 2020
- They want 2 years to restore after quarrying instead of 1
  - We want the end date & restoration plans promised by Bolton Planners to the people of Horwich in 2006 to be honoured
  - This planning application has major flaws, errors & inaccuracies
  - We believe that passing this planning permission without significant amendments will be unlawful
  - We want Bolton Planning Officers to apply the proper scrutiny to this application that they are legally bound to do
Montcliffe Extension Application

• At first glance - an planning application with some merit?
  • The Need
    • Montcliffe contains 1,400,000 tonnes of crushed rock
    • There is not just a need, but a shortage of crushed rock
  • The Environment
    • “The Environmental Statement has considered all of the relevant factors that could affect this proposal” [including HGVs]
  • Comprehensive
    • “this Planning Application, Environmental Statement and accompanying details comprehensively provides all the relevant criteria to facilitate the proper determination of the application”
  • No cumulative impact
    • “If Pilkington extension goes ahead [as well as Montcliffe extension] there will potentially be some cumulative landscape and visual impacts. None of these are judged to be significant”
BUT
Montcliffe Environment

• The purpose of the environmental statement is to assess the environmental effects of proposed development, including any cumulative ones, in order to inform the consideration of the application by statutory and other consultees, planning officers and Committee.

• Includes environmental impact of restoration
Cumulative Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Montcliffe</th>
<th>Pilkington 2 (JR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>1,400,000 tonnes</td>
<td>2,000,000 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block stone</td>
<td>‘Some’</td>
<td>880,000 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shale</td>
<td></td>
<td>280,000 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Extraction</td>
<td>1,400,000 tonnes</td>
<td>3,160,000 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of quarrying</td>
<td>2020 – 9 years</td>
<td>2026 – 16 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction per year</td>
<td>155,000 tonnes / year</td>
<td>200,000 tonnes / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily HGV movements</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Landbank Needed?

- **Montcliffe extension application states**: “There is currently a shortfall in the landbank for primary aggregates within the Greater Manchester area. The existing landbank for crushed rock currently stands at around 8 years, although this also includes reserves from inactive sites so, in reality, the actual available landbank could be significantly lower.”

- Approved 2,000,000 Pilkington 2 NOT included

- Reduced demand due to
  - Major economic downturn
  - Increased use of secondary aggregates (recycled bricks etc)

- Latest GM figures show landbank of **13.15 years**

- [At current levels] current permitted reserves would last for 25 years to 2033.

- Most recent North West landbank for crushed rock is 32 years!

- **WE DEMAND PROPER SCRUTINY OF THE LANDBANK FIGURES**
HGV Impact

- Traffic Impact Assessment **mandatory** if planned development creates:
  - 30% increase in HGVs generally
  - 10% increase in HGVs in sensitive areas
    - Town centre, school, leisure centre, conservation area
- Application for Montcliffe extension creates 80 HGV movements
- How many non-quarry HGVs on Chorley Old Road do YOU see?
- Planning application says the increase in HGVs towards Horwich Town Centre is just **8%**
- We estimate these 80 HGVs create more than **70%** increase in HGVs on Chorley Old Road
### HGV Baseline Figures

#### “Goods Vehicles”

- **4 Buses per day!!** (Actual 160 in 24 hours)
- **11 Quarry hours:** 7am – 6pm

Montcliffe Application

HGV baseline = 296 ‘Goods Vehicles’

---

**Table: Average Vehicle Flows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon-Fri</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>7-Day Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>584</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>418</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Weekday Vehicle Speeds (mph)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>% Speeds</th>
<th>% % Speeds &gt; 40mph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Weekday Vehicle Classes (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. “%” indicates data not available / could not be calculated.
HGV Baseline (Target <10% increase in sensitive areas)

- True Baseline TFGM 2010 survey 71%
  - Leave buses in, 112 HGVs (TFGM)
- Include all ‘Goods Vehicles’ 32%
- All ‘Goods Vehicles’, 24 hour data 27%

296 average daily ‘Goods Vehicle’ baseline used in application for combined East & West baseline

- 240 ‘Pilkington 2’ HGVs added to baseline
- BOTH WAYS with favourable split (Feb 2009 3 hrs):
  - East (split) 146 + 296 = 442 11%
  - West (split) 94 + 296 = 380 [390] 8%
HGV Figures

- Impact of Montcliffe PLUS Pilkington 2 = over 286% compared to non-quarrying HGV baseline
- 320 HGVs equates to the 1,000,000 tonnes / year for recycling facility in Grand Plan
- Quarrying only, does not include HGVs for restoration to be agreed after quarry permission approved!
- No restrictions to prevent ALL HGVs going through Horwich Town Centre!
- Lack of scrutiny of figures is at best incompetent & puts OUR lives & our CHILDRENS lives at risk
- Planning committee informed of incorrect HGVs at Pilkington 2 application – but ignored
  - We received HGV source data from planning inspector, NOT in planning application where it should be
  - Available only due to Armstrongs appealing rejected Pilkington application
  - Stats only available at the last minute, but we were then criticised for delays!
- To continue without a full traffic impact assessment is unlawful
- If such fundamental mistakes as HGV & Landbank figures can be made.....
  - Could the remaining 1,400,000 tonnes stone reserves be incorrect?
  - Could other aspects of the planning application have similar flaws?

We demand proper scrutiny of the Montcliffe Extension Environmental Statement by Bolton Planning Officers – no more unlawful decisions please
Montcliffe Quarry Promises (2006)

**Promise**

- No land filling
- Sympathetic restoration
- No more impact on residents
- Planning control
- No more extensions
- Definitely no more extensions
- Absolutely, definitely no more extensions

**Bolton Planning Officers Comments last extension application**

- “The Applicant has confirmed that there is to be no landfilling of the quarry after completion of the works”
- “The proposed restoration plan will ensure that ... the .... scheme will respect the Green Belt location of the site.”
- Greater Manchester Geological Unit: “concerned about the quality of life enjoyed by the nearby residents if quarrying is prolonged”
- “The development ... shall cease not later than 21st September 2011, be progressively restored within one year to ensure a satisfactory form of development and control life of the site.”
- “The Applicant ... is confident that the additional time period requested will be satisfactory.” [to complete extraction]
- “the proposal should be permitted for the specified timescale .. on the basis that there would be no further delay in the completion of operations and restoration.”
- “The Applicant has given assurances that the Council will not be approached with further delays and it is recommended that the proposed extension of time be approved on this basis.”
Montcliffe Restoration Plans
Promised Montcliffe Restoration

Cotton grass peat bog

Acid grass heath with gorse

Acid grass heath with heather

Cotton grass peat bog
### Promised Montcliffe Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise</th>
<th>Detail from approved restoration documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass planting</td>
<td>Acid grass mixture of fescue &amp; bent species is to be seeded following any necessary cultivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid Grass mix</td>
<td>25% Creeping Red Fescue: 30% Chewings Fescue: 15% Hard Fescue 10% Slender Creeping Red Fescue 20% Highland Browntop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to local conditions</td>
<td>The use of a non-competitive seed mix will facilitate encroachment into the site of local plant communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond life</td>
<td>Existing water bodies will be retained ....natural colonisation by aquatic vegetation will be assisted by introducing suitable species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>Woodland planting on quarry floor &amp; upper benches including Sessile Oak, Rowan, Alder, Hazel, hawthorn &amp; Grey Willow mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care after planting</td>
<td>Until established all plants shall be kept free of competing weed growth in an area no less than 0.6 sq m at the base of each plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Tree shelters shall be regularly checked and adjusted to prevent chafing or other damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning control</td>
<td>An aftercare programme will be submitted to the local planning authority approval, the results of which will be reviewed annually over a 5 year period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Montcliffe Extension Other

- Mine shafts – blasting vibration & water contamination from in-fill

Photo taken “somewhere under Montcliffe Quarry”
“Residents Montcliffe Issues”

- Speeding lorries down Chorley Old Road
  - “Any extension of the extraction deadline is an accident waiting to happen.”
- 2 residents observed noise level measurements being taken on days when no work being done in quarry
- Proper pedestrian access required to Georges Lane with 320 HGVs from Montcliffe & Pilkington 2
- Why is the restoration plan to be submitted after planning approval?
- “It is about time that the Council started to care for this beautiful and special area as much as the residents do.”
What can YOU do

• Write to Object
  • Bolton Council website [www.bolton.gov.uk/planapps](http://www.bolton.gov.uk/planapps)
  • Instructions emailed to you after this meeting
  • Email [ragequarry@gmail.com](mailto:ragequarry@gmail.com) to receive email updates
  • Or sent letter to Bolton Planning, Bolton Town Hall BL1 1RU – quote application 86368/11

• Register YOUR VOICE
  • You must say how the plans will impact YOU and why YOU object to them.
  • Template letters are considered as a petition rather than individual objections
  • 100 individual objections are 100 times more powerful than one petition with 100 signatures

State your personal reasons why you think this development should not take place.
Planning Permissions
Planning Applications Update


4. 84065/10 – Granted Jan 2011 – Judicial Review

5. 86368/11 – Consultation until July 2011

• Question – Do we have the support & funds to continue?
Judicial Review (JR)

- Legal review of planning decisions in the courts
  - Plus – Objective, only planning issues relevant, gives us a voice
  - Minus – Expensive & only cancels the decision - the applicant can re apply
    - But hopefully mindful that inadequate / unlawful planning applications will not work
    - The extra detail provided in the Montcliffe application allows better scrutiny

- Buxtons Solicitors – Environmental & Public Law Specialists

- First JR case led to 2 planning permissions being quashed
  - Funded by some local residents & bheag - Donations please

- JR against Pilkington Extension is being contested by Bolton Council

STOP PRESS – Judge ruled today granting permission for judicial review

Yet again our concerns are being backed by the legal process

But WHY are we having to go through this process?
Our Action
What do we want?

• We want to stop the Quarries in Rivington Greenbelt becoming a giant waste processing centre and waste dump!
• We want planning applications to receive proper, lawful & fair scrutiny
• We want promises to the people of Horwich to be kept
• We want the voice of local residents to be properly heard
• We want Bolton Council & Armstrongs come clean about their long term plans for Montcliffe & Pilkington quarries
We need your help

• **Raffle Tickets**  Volunteers to gather final entries while I finish

• **Events organisers**  We want to organise a fund raising event

• **Expertise**  Legal, Planning, Environmental

• **Research**  Reading documents, finding issues, errors

• **Administration**  Follow up meetings, coordinate volunteers etc...

• **Petition**  Anyone who has not signed - please do tonight

Please let us know of any expertise you have that could be useful
What can we do? – Gaining Support

• Getting Organised

• RAGE Action Group
  • Not Charitable status

• Over 800 Email subscribers & Facebook followers

• Thousands of bheag website visitors

• RivingtonRage.org website set up
What can we do? – Petition

- Target at least 4,000 signatures
  - 4,000 signatures means petition has to receive a full council debate (200 sheets)
  - Over 3,200 completed
  - Please take some with you (NO duplicates)
  - Complete by end July
  - Hand in at New Chapel Post Office

- “We the undersigned object to extending the life of Montcliffe and Pilkington quarries for stone extraction, waste recycling or dumping of waste. These proposals will harm this area and go against promises made on earlier planning permissions. We request that we are able to present our case to the council and that the council presents its plans for this area together with the reasons underlying their position.”
What can we do? - Fundraising

• Cheques payable to.. Rivington Against Greenbelt Exploitation

• PayPal on RivingtonRage.org website

• Almost £10,000 already contributed by individuals & local residents associations in last 2 years – mainly legal bills

• Over £3,000 raised since last meeting

• More funds required for ongoing legal battles & campaign

• Even though we won the argument with the first Judicial Review & promised costs - likely to get less than 75% back
We Need Your Help?

- **Be there** – Turn up, sign up to emails, show poster
- **Help out** – Petition, leaflets & protest letters
- **Get Involved** – Time, skills, organising

- **Email** ragequarry@gmail.com to receive email updates

- **Showing support**
  - STOP the QUARRY - Window Poster
  - RAGE Badge (suggested £10 donation), Last chance to buy a raffle ticket!
What Now?

- Stay after for...
  - Raffle prizes
  - Drinks at the bar
    - (support RMI who have supported this meeting)
  - Pick up
    - ‘STOP the QUARRY’ poster(s)
    - Petition
- Donations, badges & raffle Table A
- Pick up Petitions & Posters Table B
- Offer of help & Information Table C
End of Presentation