

Preferred Area O - Common Field, Betchworth	
Mole Valley DC	<p>Object strongly to the allocation of the Common Field in the draft plan.</p> <p>General: Insufficient evidence to justify its inclusion. Potentially significant hydrological and ecological implications of quarrying in this location and uncertainty about implications of access through a tunnel on the restoration of the existing quarry to the north. Not satisfactory to rely on applicant to put forward this information at planning application stage after the principle of extraction has been established through the plan making process. Believe that once site included in the Plan unlikely that a planning application would be refused. County Council is effectively seeking to establish the principle of extraction without considering all the evidence.</p> <p>Access: Not clear how land to the north could be used for access as it is to be restored by 2016.</p> <p>Landscape & open space: Do not accept that impact on landscape will be 'moderate to low' because a) extraction from this site would open up a new part of the countryside extending its impact onto a much wider landscape (cf Reigate Rd quarry which is well contained by the A25) b) Landscape assessment recognises that this site is different from the characteristic features of the Holmesdale Greensand Valley in that it has few hedgerows c) Planting may help screen the impact of mineral working, but the addition of hedgerow and tree belts would significantly and adversely alter the landscape of the area and prejudice the open sloping nature of the site which the landscape assessment recognises is its particular characteristic d) Sloping nature of site means that extraction in the north part of the field will be more prominent from the south than if the field was level thereby increasing its prominence in the landscape e) introduction of bunds and planting would prejudice open setting and character of Betchworth Village e) SCC's landscape consultants concluded that working of this site would result in the loss of open countryside and the erosion of landscape character in the locality.</p> <p>Although the sites methodology took cumulative impact into account it is difficult to see how common field was included in final list as the area has experienced sand quarrying since 1948, quarrying is currently taking place and there is an outstanding permission for quarrying on an adjoining area which is unlikely to be completed until 2016. Amounts to 68 years of sand extraction which is overly long for the community to have to endure. Local landscape character is already strongly influenced by the indirect impacts resulting from mineral extraction in the area. Residents already subject to noise disturbance, HGV traffic on local roads and dust. Cumulative impact of this with a further extension of the quarrying operations on common field is unreasonable and contrary to SCC's own assessment criteria.</p>
CAMEL	<p>Access: Draft Minerals Plan - Appendix 1D, page D75. Applicants are required to address the potential delay in working and restoration of the land at the existing site (Reigate Road quarry) because Common Field will be accessed from this site via a tunnel under Old Reigate Road. This contravenes exiting planning conditions and implies that restoration of Reigate Road Quarry will not take place until Common Field has been extracted, so prolonging blight in the area. There is a conflict in the draft plan between restoration at the earliest opportunity and keeping HGV movements down. (i) Current HGV movements are around 125 movements per week (based on 2,500t of sand extraction using 20t vehicles) before any restoration. (ii) If HGV movements are managed on a load and return basis the net figures should not increase. However, Reigate and Banstead Executive Committee recently suggested that much of the sand would be used in East London. This would inhibit any concept of load and return and naturally increase HGV movements, unless SCC decide that restoration would be at a significantly slower speed than extraction. (iii) Transportation issues are further compounded by recent grant of a CLUED for recycling waste at the existing Reigate Road site. Possibly only 20% of the material being processed can be used as backfill and the remainder will need to be transported elsewhere. There will be an increase of traffic through nearby villages and Betchworth. Statistics for Brockham show that the 85th percentile speed of HGV traffic through the village is</p>

42mph and over 52% are over 35mph, in the designated 30mph zone. This issue will be exacerbated through an increase in local traffic movements without controls of further monitoring.

Local amenity: Policy MD3 - Public open space, ROW network: SCC suggest that the bridleway should be diverted - this is unacceptable. A substantial distance would be required to ensure safety and preserve the enjoyment of school children, horse riders and dog-walkers. Suburban fencing and planting would not be an acceptable solution. The footpath along east of Common Field should be safeguarded from mineral workings. Bunds and fencing would destroy the open and rural nature of the pathway, and create an imposing avenue not conducive to collecting and dropping off children at the Acorns School, potentially forcing parents to use the highly dangerous High Street, Betchworth road instead.

Local amenity: RPS consultants report for CAMEL (Feb 2005) highlight inconsistencies in recommendations by County Engineer as to how noise levels will be limited. Draft minerals plan does not address stand offs. SCC should clarify principles and guides which govern distance and standoffs from the curtilage of adjoining properties. Variation from 150-70m appears arbitrary. SCC asked to provide details of noise assessment carried out for Common field as Common Field - as this land is at the heart of Betchworth Village the assessment should assume much higher standards than those applied to existing operations north of Old Reigate Road.

Local amenity: Air quality: Para 4.1.44 of RPS consultants report (Feb 2005). Prevailing wind will carry noise and dust across centre of Betchworth Village which includes Acorns School and the home for the elderly, Atkinson House. Assessments on impact on health of residents, growing children and the elderly are essential to ensure there is no increase in conditions such as asthma.

Local amenity: Question what conditions would be put in place to protect the amenities for the communities over many years.

Hydrology: Common Field is under 1.6km away from Park Pit. A recent hydro-geological report shows that activities at Park Pit have artificially lowered the water table from its natural level of 58m AOD to approx. 50.5 AOD which is below the requirement of existing planning conditions. Dewatering at Park Pit has required up to 1.6 million gallons of water per day - twice that required for the domestic supply in the area. Both the Environment Agency and English Nature have documented the impact of quarrying on the SSSI. The existing licence expires in 2010 in the meantime further damage to the water table and Reigate Heath is inevitable at a time when Sutton and East Surrey Water have been granted the first drought order in 11 years. Dry working of Tapwood Quarry to north of A25 has reduced the water table to 45m AOD. The Hydro-geological report states that should back pumping cease at Park Pit the water table would rise by 4-8m at Common Field. Either dewatering would be required or extraction below the water table. It is understood that machinery would allow extraction up to 5m below the water table. Concern over pollution from possible recovery of water table, use of backfill, and potential issues of leachate seeping from the landfill site at Pebble Hill. Safeguards are needed, which may require a bond, to ensure against inappropriate materials being used in backfill operations. If consent is given for extraction below the water table the issue of backfill is critical. Even if extraction was below a deleted water table and worked dry, any subsequent rise of water levels would have similar consequences. Discharging backfill into water raises concerns about what the material is and who would monitor it. Question what recourse would there be to the developer if the site were worked dry and backfilled and the consequence of pollution discovered a later date. It would involve considerable cost that SCC and the residents are unlikely to have. Proposals to backfill using adjacent Hythe beds are not sufficient to prevent pollution. Pebble Hill Landfill site - for general landfill - is less than 1.25km from Common Field. Filling has been direct into the chalk substrata most of the chalk was removed leaving a thin layer between the landfill, its leachate and aquifers below. Considerable leaching (the content of which is unknown) is occurring towards the A25 and the underlying aquifers. Potential to impact on health and safety of community as shown by borehole contamination at Lawrence Lane and Cliftons Lane from a 1995 landfill site. Leachate was found in the River Mole through dewatering activities at Tapwood Quarry. Question how thoroughly pollution issues will be considered as part of any Environment Agency required by the developer.

Landscape & open space: View from the North Downs , Box Hill , Brockham Hills and Pilgrims Way is already compromised by the increasing

	<p>Reigate Road quarry regardless of significant bunding. Existing conditions require progressive restoration of the quarry but instead the quarry has more than doubled in size with minimal restoration. This is contrary to statements in the draft Minerals Plan (C:20 7.8 C23: 9.3). This quarry will increase further if it is used to gain access to Common Field.</p> <p>Landscape & open space: Working Common Field will lead to a loss of open landscape for years for local residents many of whom have uninterrupted views of the North Downs.</p> <p>Heritage: SCC has already identified the Common Field as one of the last and best remaining examples of mediaeval strip farming in the county. It is doubted whether any restoration could return the field to its original nature and would destroy this archaeological feature.</p>
<p>Betchworth Parish Council</p>	<p>I write on behalf of the Parish Council and for all the residents of Betchworth who have clearly demonstrated their total and implacable opposition to the proposed extraction of sand from the Common Field at Betchworth. We are appalled that such strength of local feeling, and the many pertinent and cogent reasons identified for dismissing the possibility of sand extraction from this site, which is almost in the heart of the village, has been totally ignored. Consultation is a fine thing, but it is time that Surrey County Council actually carried out its promises, rather than indulged in fine words and zero action. We support the County's supposed vision statement that "Surrey is a great county that benefits from the beauty and richness of its natural and built heritage, the diversity of its landscape, and distinctiveness of its communities and strength of its economy. The vision for Surrey is one that will safeguard and enhance these strengths and improve the quality of life for people living and working in Surrey by addressing social, economic and environmental well-being and sustainability". However we bitterly regret that this appears to be ignored and irrelevant in respect of the Mineral and Waste Development Plans, where Surrey County Council is rushing headlong to comply with Government targets, to the detriment of the county's heritage and the wishes of its residents. Page 2 There seems little point in re-iterating in detail the many arguments which have been so ably presented to your Officers by our local protest group CAMEL. However I summarise below the most vital reasons that Betchworth Residents and their Parish Council have identified as major factors in opposing the County's decision to include the Common Field in the Preferred Options. The proposed site lies close to the centre of the village and contains a footpath and bridle way that provide the main pedestrian artery between the Post Office/Village Shop, the school, the church and the well known Dolphin Inn. Any development here will disrupt the everyday life of the village, and despite any ameliorating plantings or 'bunds' damage the quality of life of most villagers. The residents of Betchworth have lived for 60 years with sand extraction taking place discreetly around the village. (We can not therefore be accused of not taking our fair share of supplying minerals for the good of the wider community). However the extent of the current workings has expanded dramatically over the last decade, whilst restoration has stalled. This has resulted in an encircling movement, with further extensions due over the next 5 years alongside the telephone exchange and the Old Folk's Home at Atkinson House. The use of the Common Field would extend this encroachment yet further into the village, beyond the natural boundary of Old Reigate Road, and devastate the life of the parish and of the precious wild life which inhabits this field. In particular we note that this field is a nesting site for skylarks which have been given the highest conservation priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Quarrying will destroy this vital habitat for ever, and hasten the decline of this rare species. The Common field is a wonderful open and scenic area enjoyed by locals and visitors alike. Quarrying here will scar the Surrey landscape for generations and damage the enjoyment of the adjacent Area of Great Landscape Value, and of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Furthermore there is a significant danger that these scars will remain in perpetuity, as the availability of inert material to restore these eyesores is rapidly reducing with the improving efficiency of recycling. We are now alerted to the potential dangers of quarrying on water resources. We are currently suffering the worst drought for over 100 years with hosepipe bans and drought orders in force, and yet Park Pit in Buckland is pumping up to 1.6 million gallons of water a day into the River Mole as Page 3 waste. This absurd abstraction of water is obscene and should be stopped immediately to conserve domestic water supplies. This of course is likely to result in water levels at the</p>

	<p>Common Field rising, and will demand that sand quarrying in this area should in future be restricted to well above the true level of the water table. CAMEL has also brought to our attention the evidence of water contamination at 2/3 boreholes in the Buckland area, and made us aware that toxic leachates from nearby landfill sites have released ammonia into the domestic water supply. The Common Field is about 1.25km due south of Pebble Hill landfill site which sits on the chalk aquifer. Leachate from Pebble Hill Quarry Landfill Site is likely to enter the aquifer and contaminate the water held there. Quarrying below this site could result in areas of contaminated open water, threatening the safety of nearby residents and widening the contamination of the environment and the nearby River Mole. In conclusion I can only ask you yet again to consider very carefully the damage that you are proposing to cause to this rural community and to balance your duties of care to your residents with the undiluted demands of central government, whose wholesale planning of houses across the South East has just been criticised by a Select Committee for failing to consider even the availability of such a basic commodity as water. Are you convinced that the need for this modest volume of Betchworth sand can really be justified? If the mineral team is truly reflecting Surrey County Council's vision statement, then it has no option but to reject the Common Field from its plan. Failure to do so will inevitably damage the quality of life of Betchworth parishioners, and cause unnecessary and untold stress to young and old alike for many years to come.</p>
Brockham Parish Council	<p>Brockham Parish Council objects to the development of The Common Field at Betchworth for mineral extraction. We object on the following grounds: 1. The destruction of a rural setting where wildlife, in particular skylarks will have their habitat removed. The associated eyesore of a quarry coupled with the noise pollution that will affect not only Betchworth but Brockham where many houses will overlook the site. 2. The impact that there already has been in the area on the water table through decades of extraction without proper controls. This has had an effect on Reigate Heath where some of the marshland has dried out. This, together with the leaching out of toxic waste from local landfill sites will have a major impact on water supplies in the coming years. 3. We are particularly concerned with the restoration of the site if the minerals are extracted. We understand that there is already a major shortage of inert waste with which to fill existing "holes" so it is unlikely that any new ones will be refilled over a short period. The fact that the county doesn't have funding to employ enough inspectors to monitor these sites now suggests that in the future all manner of toxins could be dumped in these sites and nobody be aware of it for many years. As you may be aware, there is a landfill site close to the current quarried area, that was filled in the 1930s and is now emitting methane gas. 4. To take away the extracted products and to fill the site will involve a large number of extra traffic movements by HGVs over many years and they will have to be driven over roads that are already overcrowded or currently unsuitable for the purpose. It may be necessary to extract more sand for building purposes to meet the government's misguided ideas for the south east of England but this site is not, in our view, an appropriate one. Only now are we beginning to see the results of over 60 years of extraction in the locality. If current legislation had been in place then, we are sure that much of what has taken place would not have been allowed. Now is the time to prevent any further damage.</p>
Buckland Parish Council	<p>Buckland Parish Council register their objection to the inclusion of PMZ 55, Betchworth Common Field, into the Mineral Plan. We object on the grounds of loss of amenities for our neighbouring villages of Betchworth and Brockham and for the over exploitation of the mineral resources in our area with the loss of large areas of open countryside and damage to the environment.</p>
Charlwood PC	<p>As a neighbouring parish to Betchworth in the rural area of Mole Valley south of the A25 Charlwood Parish Council OBJECT to the inclusion of the Common Field, Betchworth as a preferred site for the extraction of sand. No village is an island and therefore Charlwood supports Betchworth Parish Council in their objection: developments which spoil one village in a particular part of Surrey have an impact on neighbouring villages in that area. The Common Field is an important open area of countryside as a backcloth to the surrounds of Betchworth village and residential properties which should be preserved Charlwood Parish Council support the objections set out by Mole Valley District Council to the inclusion of the Common Field, Betchworth, for the extraction of sand in the Surrey Minerals Plan.</p>

<p>Brockham Green Village Society</p>	<p>The Surrey Minerals Plan Preferred Option is a very comprehensive document offering a considered framework. Our comments broadly follow your response form.</p> <p>Common Field, Betchworth</p> <p>a. Betchworth and Brockham have a long historical relation perhaps as far back as the Bronze Age, but certainly Roman times. The Common Field has been an important link to both communities as a shared amenity. The extension of Reigate Road Quarry closer to the heart of Betchworth for up to two generations or more will do nothing to maintain effective and lasting relationships between the communities. This is in direct opposition to other Council policies which seek to build and enhance communities.</p> <p>b. Hydrology - Groundwater levels are at their lowest for nearly 100 years and Sutton and East Surrey Water have been granted a drought order for the first time since 1995, in addition to the hosepipe and sprinkler bans which have been in place since April 2005. In reports commissioned by Campaign Against Mineral Extraction and Landfill (CAMEL), regarding the quarrying activities at Park Pit, less than 1.6km away, it is clear that operations there have depleted the water table by at least 6m severely harming water levels to the east at Reigate Heath which again is only 1.6km away. The operators here are dewatering up to 1.6m gallons of water a day, more than twice the domestic water use in the area, and are licensed to do so until 2010, further depleting the aquifer. Criminally, this water is being pumped as waste into the Shagbrook and River Mole. The impact of such activities on the Common Field is as yet unsure, but it would be reasonable to assume that activities at Park Pit would affect the water table in a radius up to 2km – taking in the Common Field and Reigate Heath. Estimates by HIS have suggested that should dewatering stop at Park Pit, then water levels at the Common Field could rise between 4– 8m. This would have the effect of suggesting extraction would be affected by the rising water table. Clearly this is a complex issue and it is the view of this Society that to leave hydro geological surveys to a potential developer is not satisfactory or ethical as the issue is one that stretches across the North Downs not simply within a locale. Any operations that impact the availability of scarce water resources must be considered as entirely undesirable.</p> <p>c. Pollution There are three broad areas of concern two of which are closely connected to the issue of hydrology.</p> <p>i. Noise, dust and vibration: The existing quarry at Reigate Road is in the main on the fringes of Betchworth and has limited effect on properties and quality of life of residents. However, the proposal to extract sand at the Common Field brings the operations into the heart of the community. Prevailing winds from the North West will blow dust and carry noise across the heart of the village, including the Acorns First School. This cannot be healthy for residents or indeed children, where an increase of incidents of asthma or other breathing related conditions may well be a by product. Seasonal north-easterlies will also blow dust towards Nutwood Avenue in Brockham.</p> <p>ii. Should the water table rise in the near or distant future, the issue of extraction below the water table raises significant concerns about pollution through backfill. While it is understood that backfill should be inert, there is no guarantee and may not come to light until many years later when land restored to arable farming may become sterile. While the Council wish to safeguard sources of minerals, what safeguards are there for the environment? In order to limit the potential risk, it should be a condition of planning that any extraction should be above the natural water table.</p> <p>iii. Experience at Tapwood Quarry to the north of Park Pit has shown that nearby landfill sites have, as a consequence of mineral extraction, helped contaminate nearby boreholes and watercourses. Sutton and East Surrey Water had to sleeve contaminated boreholes and drill down an additional 1.8m to ensure the domestic supply was pollution free. In addition the water company have had to install processing equipment to remove contaminants. Leachates such as ammonia have been recorded in Shag Brook and the River Mole showing the extent of poor management of water resources and the negative impact of industrialisation on the environment. The Common Field is under 1.25km due south of Pebble Hill landfill site. This site sits on a chalk aquifer so leachate will find its way into the water table very easily. A poorly managed and monitored site, SCC filed to enforce planning conditions with the consequence that it is not known what harmful material is buried at the site – ammonia, lead, heavy metals. This environmental 'time bomb' is a disaster waiting to happen and quarrying to the south of it could well exacerbate the problem as</p>
---------------------------------------	--

Tapwood has further along the A25. Again, leaving such a vital SEA to developers is a gross abdication of responsibility by SCC.

d. Ecology - The Common Field is a breeding ground for skylarks, which have the highest conservation protection and priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. This rapidly declining species has fallen by over 54% in the last 25 years. The destruction of this important habitat and breeding group will contribute to further decline. What safeguards are SCC putting in place for the future of this species? In addition, the Common Field is a gathering ground for migrating Canadian Geese. Over several days in autumn thousands of birds flock to the Common Field where they gather before migrating from the UK. While Canadian Geese are not a protected species this activity will be affected detrimentally and rob the area of a special natural event.

e. Landscape - Betchworth and Brockham are two designated conservation areas and the Common Field lies within the Green Belt, close to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and an Area of Great Landscape Value. Over the last sixty years, the quarry at Reigate Road has grown with minimal restoration to an unwelcome eyesore in the landscape. Rapid and unrestored expansion has been most prevalent over the last 15 years where the quarry is now nearly SIX times larger than it was in the 1970s. What is more, further planning permission with increase this by at least an additional 15%. Planning conditions have been manipulated and activities that were supposed to have been completed in 2002 have been extended by up to 5 years. The excavation of the Common Field will at least double the size of the quarry and blight the landscape for generations. If SCC were genuinely concerned about the landscape value, ongoing restoration should be an essential part of the planning conditions and enforcement is critical. Clearly this has not been the case. What then the chances should the Common Field be developed?

f. Traffic - Although SCC suggest that any net increase in traffic movements at the Reigate Road quarry should be kept to a minimum, this in practice will not be the case if a full programme of restoration at the earliest possible time is undertaken.

i. Extraction will only be at the current rate if an increase in net movements is to be minimised. The blight on property and landscape will therefore be considerably longer than the ten year lifespan of the plan.

ii. As restoration has not begun at the existing quarry significant amounts of backfill will be required to fill the existing hole let along any new holes as a consequence of existing planning permissions and possibly extraction at the Common Field. The quarry has grown significantly over the last thirty years, if net increases in HGV traffic movements should not increase then it will be at least two generations before the land is restored. To calculate a load and return to minimise traffic is unlikely given the logistics of where the sand will be needed and the availability of inert backfill. iii. The granting of a recent CLUED at the existing site will mean an increase in traffic anyway. Backfill brought in for processing will leave potentially 20% at Reigate Road and the remaining 80% will have to be transported elsewhere. Much of this will increase local traffic issues through the villages in the Dorking Rural Box. In Brockham over 52% of HGV traffic travels at speeds in excess of 35mph in a 30mph limit endangering the lives of residents and children, while creating a anti-social nuisance. Of considerable concern is that the highest recorded speed of an HGV through Brockham was 61mph with no enforcement and no monitoring save for action by this Society.

iii. Restoration - Nothing short of complete and full restoration is acceptable to this Society. Of critical importance is the availability of inert backfill. SCC indicate significant shortfalls in backfill material and the industry itself through the Quarry Products Association have indicated that quarries will not be restored because of this shortage. In the Preferred Option document you state that restoration of the Common Field would be a priority, however what you do not state is that hundreds of thousands of tonnes of backfill are already required to restore the existing workings. The maths do not work.

In summary, the Surrey Minerals Plan Preferred Option is a comprehensive document full of altruistic visions and goals with little relation to one the ground application. SCC set out targets and goals for developers and abdicate any responsibility for decision making and assessment or for improving their own processes and procedures that will ensure objectives are met to satisfy the communities that will be most effected. SCC, against all its grand statements have not indicated that their view of mineral extraction is holistic and make no reference to cumulative impacts of

	existing sites in Appendix D – a gross and misleading presentation of fact. Given the substantial arguments above, this Society are vehemently against further mineral extraction at the Common Field and indeed urge SCC to ensure that the existing quarry is properly restored before embarking on further development in the area.
Reigate Society	The site is within a major aquifer therefore a full hydrological risk assessment should be completed before any approval is given for extraction. The site is within an AONB & an AGLV. It will be highly visible from the North Downs Way - the visible impact should be minimised if extraction is approved. Strict imposition of measures to prevent the impact of noise and dust on neighbouring properties will be required if extraction is approved.
Dorking & District Preservation Society	<p>1. The Dorking & District Preservation Society has diligently made representations on the many stages of the Minerals and Waste Plans since these were introduced over the last few years. To this end the Society has been represented in specific workshops and has also taken part in meetings to discuss the impact on communities of working the sites located in PMZ 55 and PMZ 60 with others like CAMEL at Betchworth Community Hall.</p> <p>2. With this history we are particularly disappointed that the preferred options do not meet our views of the main policies in this document nor indeed in the selection in particular of the extraction of soft sand in the preferred area O: The Common Field, Betchworth. Our support for rejection of the Shag Brook site (PMZ 60) did have some effect as this site was dropped from the main list of sites but our main criticism of this consultation is that there has been no feedback from anything we have said or written over the long drawn-out stages of policy wording and site selection.</p> <p>3. The Society do not agree with the five objectives of the overall approach in the Plan.</p> <p>4. Objective No 1 - Reducing demand for minerals. This is unnecessary and unrealistic as the County Council does not have the power or means to control the demand for minerals without the introduction of entirely new legislative powers by government. To say that the aim is to reduce demand when it will not be possible significantly to reduce the demand for primary minerals by using them wisely or by increasing recycling by re-use of demolition materials detracts from the effectiveness of the plan.</p> <p>5. Objective No 2 - Safeguarding the supply of Minerals. Safeguarding mineral supply on the territorial scale shown on the Minerals Proposals Map will be impossible given the settlement pattern and designated protected areas in Surrey. Policies MC4 (Aggregate Supply), MC5 (Non-aggregate Supply) and Policy MC6 (Maintaining Mineral Reserves) depend substantially on the effective implementation of Policy MC7 (Protecting communities and the environment) Given the significant difficulty experienced in conserving and managing specific sites for extraction of minerals with the co-operation of communities is so unlikely that it is unrealistic.</p> <p>6. Objective No 3- Minimising adverse impacts on communities and the environment by co-operating with communities in the working of minerals will be well nigh impossible when selection of preferred sites have been so contested, across the 18 preferred areas in the Plan. We have contested the criteria used in the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) as the combination of factors adopted do not measure the social disruption involved by working the mineral deposits. The Society fail to understand how it will be possible to demonstrate that an area like O - The Common Field at Betchworth can be brought into use for extraction of soft sand with the cooperation of the people of Betchworth.</p> <p>7. Objective No 4- Minimising adverse impacts from transportation of minerals. The Society believe that access for HGVs to the Area O at Betchworth will be prove to be attended by some difficulty. Imposing conditions on the operation of heavy traffic in the grant of planning permission will be difficult as this area is adjacent to the villages of Brockham and Betchworth. Certainly costs to the operator will be significant in proving unimpeded access to the area. Effects on the villages of the area will be cumulative and the traffic management engineering disbenefits are likely to weight the costs against the value of the sand extracted. The aim to encourage non road transport is not realistic given the absence of rail infrastructure with access to the mineral zones across a wide area of Surrey.</p> <p>8. Objective No 5- Restoration of workings to a high standard. This aim seems to be fraught with difficulty. Policies MC9 Restoration - and Policy</p>

	<p>MD8 Restoration and after-use both have grave weaknesses. MC9 states that restoration will be envisaged at the early stage of planning and MD8 will only be given when the site is restored to recover the character and setting of the wider area and will sustain an appropriate after-use. A good example of the problems to be encountered with these policies is Area 0 The Common Field in Betchworth with identified archaeological origins belonging to an early historical time when an open field agricultural system was in place. This area is not going to be adequately replaced by restoration. The initial workings may not necessarily uncover early main historical features and when these are dug out it will be too late to plan and recover any of the important features. The area is an open field largely undisturbed since the medieval period. It is clear that a planning application will not have the archaeological details to enable suggestion of a scheme to recover and manage the area. Surely these attributes must act to remove the area from the preferred list.</p> <p>9. Finally in relation to this round of consultation, the Society do not consider it feasible or indeed possible to accept the very great use of water involved in extracting a planned extraction of the identified supply of soft sand from the 0 Common Field at Betchworth. The Society notes that in this continuing period of dry weather underground sources of fossil water are being affected. It will not be possible to ensure conservation of these resources in this area at a time of draught. For these reasons, and taking into account the other factors mentioned against the selection of the Common Field, Betchworth as a preferred area for extraction of soft sand, the Society continues to urge the area of the Common Field at Betchworth be excluded from Policy MA3.</p>
Betchworth Operatic and Dramatic Society	<p>The proposed extraction of sand from Betchworth Common Field and the ancillary problems which would arise from this would result in danger on the roads and general anxiety to local people. Many residents consider it their duty to conserve the village as far as possible for future generations. Gentle changes always occur in a living environment but the rape and destruction of a beautiful field and efficiently functioning community cannot be regarded as either gentle or necessary for the current or future well-being of the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise and dust pollution would affect the children in the neighbouring village school. The unnecessary disruption of children's education and health is to be deplored. 2. Households near the existing sand extraction area are already badly affected by dust. The proposed new site would increase this pollution and adversely affect many other houses, including Atkinson House sheltered accommodation and the village shop and Post Office, both essential to the village. The Post Office is now the only one between Dorking and Reigate and is thus often very busy. Access must not be impaired. 3. Common Field lies in a central position and links the main routes used every day for the normal conduct of civilised living, including the ability of people to walk in safety away from traffic on the narrow roads. 4. The erection of a bund along one side of the field would darken and restrict the footpath leading from Old Reigate Road to the school and thence to The Street. The possibility of danger from predatory strangers to children on foot, or other walkers, cannot be ignored. 5. Heavy lorries used to and from the site for the carrying of equipment and loads in the preparation, ongoing extraction and the subsequent reparation of the site would cause huge congestion and danger on the narrow roads flanking the site, for years. Deterioration of the road surface would ensue and involve expensive repairs. 6. Local water resources have already been diminished to an alarmingly low level through their massively high use and subsequent wastage through sand extraction. 7. Access for emergency service vehicles could be badly restricted and result in delay to fire and ambulance crews reaching their destination, with obvious danger to persons and property. 8. Huge disruption would be caused by the digging of a tunnel under the road, which it is understood could be the means of disgorging the sand. Lorries and heavy earth-moving equipment would effectively close Old Reigate Road and its link via Kiln Lane to Brockham, a route which is

	<p>consistently used by residents for access to Betchworth shops and Post Office from the Brockham side, or to additional shops and services, plus the middle school and doctors' surgery, at Brockham from the Betchworth side. The alternative route from The Avenue, Brockham, involves a dangerous right hand turn onto the A25 and could result in accidents, plus additional traffic at Betchworth roundabout which is often heavily congested from the build-up of vehicles regularly delayed at the level crossing in Station Road.</p> <p>9. The Street, Betchworth, is very narrow, winding and walled, with properties right to the verge, including the school. The additional flow of traffic which is likely to use this route as a cut-through to Brockham would cause danger to road-users and pedestrians alike, including children, and adversely affect householders and their property.</p> <p>10. Loss of the beauty of the field and its surroundings would totally change the environment which brings simple pleasure to residents who enjoy peaceful walks and the sight and sound of the birds and wild creatures which inhabit the area. Not everyone in a village such as Betchworth has the ability or the means to travel to other open spaces for recreation and should be allowed to spend their lives in peace, whether young or old. Skylarks, now on the R.S.P.B. Red List in terms of conservation, nest on the field as they have always done and are a delight to see and hear as they rise to the sky. Vaughan Williams might well have used this field as the inspiration for his beautiful and famous work "The Lark Ascending". Such places should not be destroyed.</p> <p>11. People who have choice move to Betchworth and stay to enjoy its present character, paying appropriately in purchase price and rates for the privilege. Property values are likely to be depressed and the consequent income to the Authorities would be reduced. Would-be residents would not be attracted to the area and the village could become blighted – houses would lose their value and owners could presumably expect large amounts of compensation from the County Council.</p> <p>12. Many Betchworth residents have already suffered for years from the noise and pollution of heavy lorries using Station Road and the chalk quarry area for the dumping of waste and the subsequent restoration of the hillside. Noisy lorries on this work echoed across a considerable distance and the danger on Station Road and Pebble Hill is obvious. It would not be right to allow a similar situation to arise in the confined area of the village centre.</p>
Betchworth & Buckland Society	<p>I write to you as Chairman of the Betchworth and Buckland Society. We had a Committee Meeting last week and the above matter was discussed. We as the Committee wish to object to the proposal. Our grounds for objection mirror many of those put forward in our objection to the Shagbrook site in Buckland Surrey. They include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ill effects on the hydrology of the area. 2. The effect on the environment both with regard to toxic substances and blight on the attractiveness of the countryside in an area of Surrey known for its beauty. 3. Destruction of habitat of protected species of birds etc. 4. The increase in traffic in an already congested area. All of these factors and probably many others which we are looking into point to the need to reject this site.
CPRE	<p>General: This site is visible from the AONB and AGLV and several footpaths. It is a very open site and perimeter mounding and screening would destroy its historic character. It will have a destructive impact on the entity of the village and the local community of Betchworth. The track and footpath which cross the site connect the northern and southern parts of the village and are currently very well used. There are houses and a school and nursery which could be affected by noise and dust etc.</p> <p>Hydrology: Concerned about the implications on the hydrology and lowering of the water table which will reduce the water available for domestic consumption.</p>

	Landscape & open space: Impacts on views to and from the AONB and AGLV and damage to the character of the local countryside. Agriculture: Unclear if the farm can continue as a viable unit without this land.
Betchworth and Buckland Children's Nursery	On behalf of the above children's Nursery I am registering objections to the development of a sandpit in the Betchworth Common field. 1. HYDROLOGY. Being in an area under drought orders I am extremely concerned that no further damage is done to the water table in the area. The experience at Hanson's pit in Buckland tells that 1,000,000 gallons of water is lost each day in the washing of sand. Any further activity of this nature would make the water situation worse. 2. POLLUTION. The dust created by the extraction of sand is damaging to the air around and harmful to any asthma sufferers. There is no guarantee that leachate from the Pebble Hill landfill site will not enter the chalk aquifer and contaminate water in an new open quarry 1.25 kms South, threatening the safety of local residents, and increasing the contamination of the River Mole. 3. ECOLOGY. The Common Field is a breeding ground for Skylarks - a conservation priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of birds. Quarrying would destroy this valuable habitat for ever. As educationalists we try to educate children to appreciate and value the local landscape. The example of adults destroying a landscape for profit runs counter to this. 4. TRANSPORT. The local road network is only just able to cope with the current traffic flow and does not cope if there is any problem between junctions 8 & 9 of the M25. To add to this on the minor roads by considerable HGV traffic both for the removal of sand and the bringing in of backfill would result in appalling jams and increase the dangers from traffic in the area and worsen the atmosphere. 5. LANDSCAPE. The existing neighbouring quarry has been expanding dramatically for the last decade and has not been restored. Further extensions to this quarry have been granted and with the Common Field would scar the local landscape for ages. The Common Field is next to an Area of Great Landscape Value, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and between two Conservation areas. Any quarrying and the construction of Bunds would destroy the area for generations.
Individual	General: Affordable/eco-friendly housing which does not need cement is the future
Individual	General: Respondent is well acquainted with Betchworth Village as they have family living there. Wish to object to working of this site for all the reasons referred to in the leaflet issued by CAMEL.
Individual	Access: Question how HGV traffic movements can be maintained at close to existing levels if SCC claims that restoration will take place as soon as possible. The existing quarry has yet to be backfilled; the process of load and return is not practical given the short supply of inert fill AND the existing quarry has been given permission to operate a recycling facility primarily due to negligence by SCC.
Individual	Access: HGV traffic will increase throughout the villages in the Dorking Rural box with all the consequential issues of health and safety. Question how SCC will address these issues when it cannot currently regulate roads unsuited to HGVs now.
Individual	Local amenity: The diversion of footpaths and bridleways seems to be treated as a mere inconvenience when in reality, if Common Field was worked, an entire generation (or two) would not benefit from the amenity that this land currently provides. Use of footpath for the safe collection of children from the Acorns School and for individuals to make their way to the church, the public house and/or the Post Office. Consequently people will be more likely to drive or not go out - question how this meets other SCC targets and proposals.
Individual	Local amenity: Question whether SCC will not protect the residents of Atkinson House (elderly people's home) which already has quarrying on 2 sides, from further quarrying.
Individual	Local amenity: The issue of noise is poorly covered in Appendix D (page D76). Prevailing winds will carry dust and fumes and noise across Common Field. Question how this will impact on elderly and children and what monitoring will take place to ensure safety of residents over the

	lifespan of the proposed activity.
Individual	Hydrology: Policy MD3: Floodplain, Groundwater etc. Current drought order and HMG proposals for further development in the SE means that SCC cannot afford risk of further contamination to the water supply which will follow mineral extraction from the Common Field. There is already considerable precedent within the Mole Valley for such damage with its consequential reduction in the already dwindling supply of drinking water.
Individual	Hydrology: Local groundwater has already been contaminated by illegal dumping of contaminated/hazardous waste in nearby quarries. Quarrying is likely to lead to possible areas of contaminated open water in a central village zone. Landfill is not policed adequately to monitor backfilling operations and content of material used.
Individual	Hydrology: Sutton and East Surrey Water was the first water authority to impose drought restrictions. Therefore question where the water for quarrying operations will come from.
Individual	Hydrology: (i) Question how 1.6m gallons of water/day can be dewatered at an existing nearby quarry when there is a drought order in the area (ii) Question the consequences for Common Field when dewatering at Park Pit ceases in 2010. The water table should rise possibly causing pollution from backfill and pollution being drawn down from pebble Hill landfill site as was the case with Tapwood Quarry (iii) Given importance of water resources is not good enough that SCC abdicate its responsibility to the community and to developers.
Individual	Ecology: British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) confirm that good numbers of skylarks have been recorded at Common Field during the breeding season every year during 1994-2005.
Individual	Ecology: Welcome the reduction in the area of this zone, but the proposals would nevertheless destroy substantial breeding habitat for skylarks (see letter from BTO, 6 June 2006).
Individual	Ecology: Skylarks nest and feed on the ground and lay their eggs directly on the ground. Therefore any destruction of the ground destroys their breeding area and food supply. It is illegal to disturb their ground (the Greenwich Millennium Dome construction was held up by a nesting duck). Once a skylark's habitat is destroyed they cannot return. Working of only a small area of the field would deter nesting nearby.
Individual	Ecology: Even the reduced area of proposed working will destroy the habitat for skylarks - a priority red species for protection. The Minerals Plan states that 'there may be skylarks in the field'. SCC is asked to give credit to the already documented information that SCC has received to confirm that skylarks breed on Common Field.
Individual	Ecology: The draft Minerals Plan refers to the possibility that the field may contain skylarks. RSPB has previously told SCC that the field does contain skylarks, an RSPB priority protected species, and provides an essential breeding ground.
Individual	Ecology: Poem submitted to express concern over quarrying of Common Field and potential impacts on the wildlife.
Individual	Landscape & open space: Policy MD3: Appearance, quality and character of landscape etc. Welcome SCC recognition that constructing large bunds and planting belts across and around the Common Field would destroy the appearance, quality and character of this unique landscape. However, this means that the impact of quarrying will be much more severe, and would potentially worsen the already severe impact of existing quarrying in the area (Reigate Road Quarry) and on views from the adjoining AONB at Box Hill.
Individual	Landscape & open space: Common Field is central to the village, connecting the church, pub and post office. It is a link and haven for local users of all ages. Therefore need to consider the hazard and danger to health to residents and visitors.
Individual	Landscape & open space: Concern over visual impact of working Common Field particularly in this open landscape that is already visually scarred

	by the Reigate Road Quarry. This existing quarry should be restored prior to any further development at Common Field. Screens and bunds will do nothing but detract from the natural landscape.
Individual	Heritage: Policy MD3: Historic Landscapes etc. It is noted that SCC still intend to destroy this historic landscape.
Individual	Heritage: Common Field is one of the few remaining examples of medieval strip farming in the County and SCC's intention is to dig it up.
Individual	Cumulative impacts: Policy MD3: Cumulative Impacts etc. Betchworth has suffered mineral extraction for over 70 year and further planning permissions will allow more. Question as to where in the draft Minerals Plan there is recognition of the cumulative impact of this long-term assault on the daily lives of local residents.
Individual	Quarrying will have an enormous effect on water resources in the area. In order to make sand extraction viable in this field, some quarrying will need to take place below the water table or water will have to be pumped out of the quarry to get access to the sand. This will have an effect on our depleted water table. The local campaigning organisation Camel has already shown that Park Pit, another sand quarry approximately 1.5 km away is, shockingly, pumping 1.6 million gallons of water a day into the River Mole as waste! Any extraction below the water table will mean that the hole created will have to be filled with inert backfill. SCC has indicated that they do not have the manpower to ensure adequate supervision of these operations, so backfill is bound to contain non-inert material. This will lead to pollution and contamination of the water supply and the land. CAMEL has already highlighted the impact of toxic leachates from nearby landfill sites at Shagbrook, which released ammonia into the domestic water supply. It would be highly irresponsible to allow this to happen again. This village has already suffered from years of noise and dirt pollution and road degradation from HGVs transporting chalk and sand. The inevitable further increase in HGV traffic taking sand away from the quarry and bringing tonnes of backfill in will not only affect rural living but add to heavy road maintenance costs for the Council. The quarrying will have an enormous and detrimental environmental impact on the landscape – short term gain will create long lasting damage. The protected species of skylark breed on the Common Field, and noise and pollution will destroy their habitat. The Common Field is adjacent to an Area of Great Landscape Value and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is sited between two Conservation Areas, so open cast quarrying will cause irreparable damage to the natural Surrey landscape for generations. I should be grateful to receive a receipt for this letter.
Individual	My principal objections are as follows: Nuisance - PMZ55 has houses in close proximity on its northern and eastern sides which, despite any intervening bunds, will be subject to unacceptable levels of noise, dust and vibration. With the prevailing wind from the west/southwest, a major part of the village will be affected to a greater or lesser extent. Landscape - Sand extraction from PMZ55 will have a devastating impact on the quality and character of the landscape. The only pedestrian footpath linking the Post Office/shop with the heart of the village provides magnificent views to Leith Hill, some 6 miles away, with Brockham Church in the middle ground. The inevitable bunds and other screening will completely obscure this view for the duration of the sand extraction and restoration. Transport - Whilst it is hoped that the bulk of HGV traffic leaving the site will be directed through Reigate onto the M25, the huge quantity of backfill material required will inevitably lead to significant extra traffic on the A25 and the B2032 Station Road/Pebble Hill Road. Restoration of Excavated Areas - Grave doubts exist about the availability of inert backfill materials in sufficient quantities to keep pace with excavation, with the probability that the landscape will be scarred for many extra years. By continuing to support the inclusion of PMZ55 in the Minerals Plan, the County Council would be blighting the quality of life in our village, possibly for a decade or more. I therefore urge you to withdraw the Common Field from consideration.

Individual	<p>At the moment there is an ongoing problem regarding the use, or lack of use, of water. There is currently a hosepipe ban in this area with the possibility of further restrictions on the consumption of water. A huge amount of water is already being used in the quarrying of sand locally and a further sand quarry would have a disastrous effect on the supply of water to the local area. The effect of a significant increase in HGV traffic on the local roads – there is only limited access to the A25. How will the extraction of sand followed by the landfill not generate extra traffic, and how long will this all take? The local roads are in a very poor condition and that is just a consequence of everyday local use – how will they cope with an obvious increase in HGV traffic? There are three local schools with Betchworth School being situated right on the boundary of the proposed site. The amount of dust and increase in exhaust fumes will surely create a health problem for the school children with possibly the increase in asthma due to polluted air. I regularly walk our dog across the beautiful Common Field and am never failed to be struck by the natural beauty and its wildlife. It is also an important habitat for the skylark, and to be able to see them rising from the ground is a thrilling sight but apparently a privileged one as numbers are declining, so much so that the RSPB have placed them on the highest conservation priority. The consequence of sand quarrying on this field would mean the destruction of this habitat for the increasingly rare bird. To finish, this field is from the local people’s point of view in an area of outstanding natural beauty and, with the prospect of the proposed sand quarry followed by landfill (how can we be sure that this does not cause pollution of another kind) means that yet another beautiful part of England is lost forever.</p>
Individual	<p>As a keen environmentalist, one of the major reasons for moving to Brockham was due to the beautiful surrounding country side; the quarry would become a visual blight on the landscape if mineral extraction takes place and alter the landscape detrimentally for generations to come. The Common field is a breeding ground for skylarks which have been given the highest conservation priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and are in global decline. The impact of the quarry will remove vital areas and thereby significantly affecting the number of viable breeding pairs. There will also inevitably be an increase in HGV traffic not only for the sand removal but also for the necessary backfill required to restore the quarry. However the major impact will be as a result of the current domestic water supplies threat. We are already in the worst drought for a century and it has been shown that Park Pit, another quarry 1.5 kilometres away is pumping 1.6 millions gallons of water per day in to the River Mole as waste. If this abstraction stops due to the need of domestic supplies water levels on the common Field will rise. Resulting in some quarrying taking place below the water table, or water having to be pumped out, resulting in a greater need for backfilling with 'inert' material, what guarantees are there that this will be adequately supervised?</p>
Individual	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your plan, which I do as follows: Your Objectives 1 - How are you encouraging use of timber in lieu of wet trades requiring sand? 2 - How are you conserving minerals when all your current efforts seem aimed to dig it all up and exhaust all supplies by 2016? 3 - In contemplating digging sand from the Common Field, neither a Developer nor the County Council will be able to minimise its impact. The impact upon this village of excavating the Common Field would be extreme. Betchworth has suffered mineral extraction for over 70 years; we fully understand the implications. We understand the damage which would be done to our surroundings, our village and the enjoyment of our daily lives. Talk of minimising offers no comfort whatsoever. The County Council has proved itself incapable of making minerals companies in this area do anything that they do not wish to do, let alone “work hard to keep impacts to a minimum”. 4- No comment 5 - I note your reference to “highest standards”. When will you be doing something to ensure the restoration of the current Reigate Road Quarry to these standards? The signal failure of the developer and the County Council to restore this site is the best possible argument for there being no further mineral extraction in Betchworth. In further response, I refer to the sub-headings under Policy MD3: Impacts on Mineral Development. Noise, Dust, Fumes etc Your revised plan does nothing to address the issues of noise, dust and fumes which I raised in my original letter to you</p>

	<p>dated 3 November 2004. Please read this again. Restoration My copy of the Shorter Oxford Dictionary defines "restoration" as "the action of restoring to a former state or position". There can therefore be no "restoration options", as suggested in your plan. Former state it is. I welcome your clear recognition that the guaranteed restoration of the Common Field would be a pre-requisite to sand extraction. However, such restoration would clearly require a substantial amount of inert fill, as indeed, the restoration of the Reigate Road Quarry already does. And your plan repeatedly states that the availability of such fill is in decline and probably insufficient. Added to this, the County has a well established track record of failure in monitoring and enforcing all activities connected with mineral extraction and landfill. If you are unable to guarantee swift restoration of the Common Field, then it cannot be destroyed in the first place. In conclusion, I welcome your initial reduction in size of the zone within the Common Field as a first step towards its eventual exclusion from the Plan. Nevertheless, I object to your continued proposal that the Common Field be dug up in the strongest possible terms for the reasons which I have explained above, before and at length. These are all sound reasons and you have provided no arguments to refute them. Your continued inclusion of this site in your Mineral Plan, in the face of the strongest possible resistance from those of us who live here exposes your entire public consultation exercise for the hollow sham that it is. Go on, prove us wrong. Take it out.</p>
Individual	<p>"Environment" is a buzz word nowadays, and all decent people do what they can to preserve it. Now it is also essential that we all save water. Everyone I know respects the hosepipe ban,, and we are all careful how we use our water in our daily life. Now it seems, a huge ruination of our environment, involving the destruction of forty five acres of Green Belt land, and the wastage of millions of gallons of the water that we try to use sparingly, is to be perpetrated upon the decent people of these Surrey villages, a dreadful blow to the environment and to attempts to save water. This disgraceful despoiling of yet more countryside in the southeast of England, will apart from the destruction of our local environment, will go a long way to ensure that the feared use of standpipes will be a reality. The plans for house building in the southeast will also have this effect, but that is another story. I beg you not to allow this disgraceful plan to be perpetrated upon the residents of these villages. I do hope the water companies announce that they will be unable to provide water on the scale needed for the working of the quarry. I wonder how many will be serious about saving half a pint of water by changing their routine when they clean their teeth! The natural response will be "Why bother? I might as well leave the tap running all day. It will be about a millionth of what will be wasted if this nasty business goes ahead."</p>
Individual	<p>I wish to register my objections (again) to any quarrying at Betchworth Common Field. Most of my arguments against quarrying were stated in my earlier letter. Rather than repeat my objections please read my heart felt poem. Nobody Cares! I drive, cycle and walk by. Its beauty never ceases to amaze me. The field I regard as mine. The torso of Betchworth. I draw my bedroom curtains. I can't believe my fortune. Its magnificence, its radiance. It fills me with wellbeing. The thought of the mindless vandalism. My field with it heart and soul ripped out. A muddy, ugly pit. Who can condone such an act? What effect will it have on the village? What effect will it have on the villagers? Who cares? No one or my nightmare would end!</p>
Individual	<p>I feel that it is totally wrong to destroy this wonderful field, which is a major part of our lives as local residents. We enjoy the field on a daily basis for example walking the dog, taking the children to school and at weekends cycling and walking the paths and enjoying the wonderful views, but aside from this there are major environmental concerns as follows:</p> <p>1. Hydrology - The impact of quarrying on water resources No doubt you are well aware of the technical arguments put forward by CAMEL regarding the problems that will be caused by quarrying on the hydrology of the area .It seems obvious that once you start to interfere with the natural landscape you will always have the knock on effects illustrated by CAMEL as follows: We are now officially suffering the worst drought for over 100 years and hosepipe bans will be in force for the foreseeable future. Research by CAMEL has shown that Park Pit, another sand quarry</p>

little more than 1.5 kilometres away is pumping 1.6 million gallons of water a day into the River Mole as waste. This abstraction of water has to stop now if water resources are to be preserved for domestic supplies. If abstraction is stopped, water levels at the Common Field would rise. This means that to make sand extraction viable, some quarrying will need to take place below the water table OR water will have to be pumped out of the quarry to get access to the sand. The problem with extraction below the water table is that the hole has to be filled with 'backfill'. This 'backfill' is supposed to be inert (i.e. harmless to the environment). Who is going to ensure that this is the case? Surrey County Council have indicated they do not have the manpower to ensure adequate supervision of these operations.

2. Pollution - The impact of quarrying on the environment Once again when you upset the natural balance, you open up a can of worms which mere humans even with their enormous mechanical equipment cannot put right. Again as CAMEL point out: CAMEL highlighted the impact of toxic leachates from nearby landfill sites at Shagbrook, which released ammonia into the domestic water supply. The Common Field is about 1.25km due south of Pebble Hill landfill site which sits on the chalk aquifer. Leachate from Pebble Hill is likely to enter the aquifer and contaminate the water held there. Quarrying below this site could result in areas of contaminated open water, threatening the safety of nearby residents and widening the contamination of the environment and the nearby River Mole.

3. Ecology - The destruction of habitat for a protected species Watching the Skylarks darting in the Common Field is wonderful and once again CAMEL illustrate the technical side also: The Common Field is a breeding ground for skylarks which have been given the highest conservation priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Skylarks are in global decline. Quarrying will not only remove a vital area of land, but the impact of noise and pollution will destroy this valuable habitat for ever and hasten the decline of this rare species.

4. Transport - Increased HGV traffic inevitable The increase in HGV traffic would quite simply have a huge negative impact on the quality of our lives in terms of health, safety and well-being. And again CAMEL say: The development of the proposed Olympic Village for the 2012 Olympic Games in East London will require sand from the local area either for direct use in the construction of the Village or to replace sand from other sources. HGV traffic leaving the Reigate Road quarry will be directed through Reigate onto the M25. In addition, hundreds of tonnes of backfill are still required to restore the existing quarry which will add significant volumes of extra HGV traffic on the A25.

5. Landscape - Visual blight for decades It is quite obvious the absolutely terrible effect that quarrying would have on the landscape and just utterly inconceivable that anyone would want to destroy it. It is a sorry state when emotional arguments are disregarded in these matters because the strong feeling held by all of us who are against the quarrying is that it is Wrong. CAMEL argue as follows: The existing quarry has been expanding dramatically for the last decade and has not been restored. Further extensions to this quarry have been granted and with the Common Field will scar the Surrey landscape for generations. Adjacent to an Area of Great Landscape Value, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and sited between TWO Conservation Areas open cast quarrying, the planting and construction of bunds' will destroy the natural Surrey landscape for at several generations. I have referred to Camel's research and technical arguments above, as they are succinctly put and I agree with what they have said. I would also like to add that the Government and Surrey County Council should be looking at building with renewable resources such as wood from managed forests. This country is so backward when it comes to the use of wooden buildings. There seems to be an obsession with the use of bricks and mortar and concrete and this needs to stop. This would then eliminate the need to destroy the landscape by quarrying. To sum up, if the potential quarrying were to go ahead you can see it would condemn Common Field as we know it, to death. This field forms an amenity for the local and wider community. It is one of the only places in the southeast where people can walk around unfenced farmland and enjoy far reaching views. the field was used as a location in the TV drama Canterbury tales as one of the only stretches of unobstructed by fencing open farmland in the Southeast. Please do not allow the quarrying to go ahead as you can see from the above it would be devastating in so many ways.

Individual	<p>I hope you are by now well aware of the depth of feeling being aroused by the suggestion of extracting sand from part of Betchworth Common Field. We recently had a vote at a CAMEL meeting attended by numerous residents of Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland to carry on the fight with our combined utmost will determination and varying expertises at our disposal. This is a fight we must win against directives from John Prescott and his team. I sincerely hope that the sound reasons upon which our objections are based will be acted upon. I have to say that it is a pity that the notion of environmental vandalism and destruction of beauty and tranquillity within one of your most lovely village settings is not enough reason alone. But it is still a reason I wish to state that I have known Betchworth for over 40 years since I was a small child. Therefore, I know and understand the area very well. My points are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ecology - (please read attached letter from the British Trust for Ornithology) Skylarks, one of our most celebrated birds nationally and historically (in poems, songs and music and essays) breed on the Common Field. The attached letter is testament to this as a Scientific Survey has demonstrated on this particular site since 1994, (see letter) But did you realise that Skylarks actually nest and feed on the ground? Their eggs are laid directly on the ground. Therefore, any destruction of the ground destroys their breeding ground and food supply. It is illegal to disturb their nests. (The Greenwich Dome construction was held up by a mere nesting duck). Once the Skylarks' habitat is destroyed they can't return. Even if the whole field is not quarried, the noise, disturbance and vehicle movements over what is currently a very tranquil spot, will deter nesting nearby. 2. Pollution We know already that the local groundwater has been contaminated from illegal dumping of contaminated / hazardous waste in nearby quarries. This has been dominated in the national press. Quarrying is likely to lead to possible areas of contaminated open water in a central village zone. Furthermore, landfill is not policed adequately to ensure that: a) the site is backfilled correctly and on time b) occasional 'odgy loads' are not dumped. No skip is ever examined in detail to see exactly what is there. The diagram on the previous page shows just how central the Common Field is to the village. The field is not just 'any old field' any in the middle of nowhere. It is in a central spot and connects the church, pub and post office - it is a link, a haven, used by people of all ages, dog walkers, (along the paths and bridle paths round the edge and one down the middle). Therefore, the hazard and danger to health of contaminated water, dust or gases to the resident & visiting population needs to be considered. Because it will not be in a hidden or tucked away part of our villages. no.. It is CENTRAL to our village. 3. Water Resources Sutton & East Surrey, which is the water company for our area, has been the FIRST in the country to impose drought restrictions. Yet sand quarrying utilises millions of gallons of water. Where is this water going to come from? 4. Need for Sand is needed for cement - yet affordable / eco-friendly housing, using little or no cement, are the way ahead for the future. 5. Surrey County Council's Role a)Duty of Care You have a duty of care for my health and well being. I live right next door to the proposed site and have been an asthmatic all my life (medical proof can be provided on request). The prevailing wind would blow dust right into my house and garden. This will severely affect my health. As well as the rest of the village if anyone has respiratory complaints. b) you have a duty of care to protect the environment and the character of the area. Betchworth's character will be destroyed if a quarry is allowed in such a visible area. c) Legal Challenged Are you prepared, on behalf of the residents, to mount a legal challenge against the central government directive for a set amount of sand? d) Caring for Vulnerable Persons Looking at my diagram, it can be seen that there is a house for the elderly alongside the quarry proposed site. The residents of this home, Atkinson House, already have quarrying on 2 sides of them. Are you prepared to allow them to be surrounded by quarries? 6. Transport Vehicle movements will be increased in an area which is totally unsuitable for this. 7. Visual blight In an area so astonishingly beautiful, the landscape will not be restored in our lifetimes. (reference the very lackadaisical approach to filling in the existing quarries).
------------	--

	8. Availability of Suitable Inert Material ...where is this going to come from for landfill? I implore you, Roger, to please please get behind the residents and help us with all your power to fight this cause. We care very passionately about it.
Individual	I object to the inclusion of the Common field, Betchworth in the preferred options in the Surrey minerals plan for the following reasons: 1. In this area we are subject to a drought order. The extraction of sand will use a lot of precious water. 2. Water will possibly become contaminated as a result of the quarrying. 3. The large number of heavy goods vehicles passing along the narrow lanes for a long time is unacceptable in a village environment because of the huge increase in volume of traffic on local roads and the resulting pollution and noise. 4. The Common field, being situated where it is in a completely exposed position to the north where the main road runs through the village, with houses along the east and west borders, between two well populated villages (Betchworth and Brockham) next to one school (Betchworth) and close to another (Brockham) is a most unsuitable site for quarrying from a health (pollution and noise) and safety (volume of traffic) point of view, and also essentially. Quarrying here will mar the landscape for a long time. 5. The Common field is one of the few remaining habitats in the country for skylarks a protected species. As a bird lover I am saddened by the decline in numbers of skylarks and resent the possible acceleration towards further decline by demolishing one of their few remaining breeding grounds. I beg you to remove the Common field, Betchworth, from the preferred options for the Surrey minerals plan.
Individual	I see no benefit to the community in continuing to dig up our greenfields especially this picturesque village location. This proposed site does not even offer building grade sand, merely the more valuable fine white sand used in glass and silica chip manufacture. The only benefit is to the land owner and his financial reward is at cost to the entire local community and neighbourhood. Therefore the proposals to quarry our land offers no benefit to the local community, simply only adds to the noise, dirt, dust, and this becomes one of the many EYE SORES thanks to your past leniency. The site is surrounded by two conservation areas, and areas considered to be of outstanding natural beauty and you believe this to be a "preferred site". What exactly is "preferred" about this site? It borders two schools; a nursery and primary, and a bridle footpath crosses the site. The suggestion of bunds to hide the site is a disgrace to the community, as this will only impair the local views enjoyed by the surrounding housing and views of the site from the vantage points at box hill and around. We are witnessing some of the driest times for years, and further quarrying will lower the water table further and upset vegetation for miles around. Looking at your website, there are many other sites proposed where impact would be far less great on the local community. Where transportation would be far more appropriate and where existing massive bunds (ie with reservoirs) would not need building. Other sites are not in the greenbelt. I am sick of SCC and their mining and quarrying plans, and it is a deterrent to move to the county. We want to attract not deter people of all ages to the area, this is what adds to the community, not digging it up for the benefit of one individual.
Individual	The qualifications listed in the summary above are all reasonable and of key importance. Notwithstanding that, the common field is indeed 'common' in the sense that it is in a strategically highly significant location with respect to a very important issue for both villages. They share a very long common history, are largely administered together and certainly share great pride in their rural beauty and tranquillity. However carefully quarrying at the common field might be managed, it would inevitably ravish the landscape between the villages and act to spoil their important synergy. I recognise that sand is an important mineral but I am totally opposed to extracting it from beneath the common field. That it would eventually be restored is in my view irrelevant because irreparable inter community damage would be wrought during the active life of the quarry.
Individual	As a local resident in The Street, Betchworth, I am puzzled as to why the Common Field has been included in the Mineral Resources Plan. The

	<p>sand reserves are relatively low and I find it difficult to understand how the potential developer could make this site a profitable proposition bearing in mind the difficulties involved in removal and transportation of the sand. I have noted in the past the inept attitude of Surrey County Council when it comes to enforcement of conditions attached to planning permission for local quarries and assume that this attitude would persist if planning approval is given to destroy the Common Field ! You can rest assured that I and many other residents will do all we can to prevent this development for the sake of our children, our village and the generations to come !</p>
Individual	<p>First I would like to stress how important the footpath on the eastern edge of the proposed quarry is to the village and all who pass through it on foot or bicycle. The only other route is down the extremely narrow and in places pavementless road called THE STREET. The footpath is the only way young children can reach the school on foot and the elderly can walk to the church. Although I know there is no intention of removing this footpath, placing a quarry immediately alongside a section of its length will profoundly affect its use. Worse, when the quarrying is finished, the landfill that will follow will be hazardous to all by its extremely close proximity. The intention is for this landfill to be inert but I understand the existing quarries in the area cannot obtain sufficient quantities of inert rubbish to fill the holes already standing empty. The thought of having a rat infested rubbish dump so close to an infants school is horrible. Secondly I worry at the effects this development will have on the hydrology of the area. If the mining around Buckland has had such an impact on the water table that nearby Reigate Heath is DRYING OUT then what will happen in Betchworth. Surely tampering with the Hydrology of the common field is to invite the contaminated waters under the landfill site just north of the A25 to be sucked down under the village. Also I might add that it seems utter madness to be in a situation where the whole area is not at present allowed to waste a single drop of water under punishment of the law, while at the same time the quarry in Buckland is pumping 1.6 million gallons of water into the river Mole every day. Thirdly I can assure you that the common field is indeed a nesting ground for Skylarks. A walk down the bridle path any day throughout the summer will attest to this. And finally, while you are listening to the Skylarks, take a look around at the wide views in every direction and tell me how you can blight such wonderful scenery.</p>
Individual	<p>I am disappointed that the Common Field remains a preferred option given the initial responses to the first draft. This site is in very close proximity to the centre of Betchworth - a matter of metres from the Post Office and the village school for example- and the environmental impact on this and the surrounding area would be devastating. The pollution from the extraction of sand and the heavy traffic generated should be a major factor against the inclusion of this area which is located between two conservation areas. The potential risk to the water supply has been well documented and the possibility of thousands of gallons of water being used in the extraction process, should a decision be made to transport it via an underground chute, is unsustainable in an area already under a drought order. I acknowledge the need to extract minerals and we in this area have lived with quarrying for many years. However, the extraction from the Common Field in the heart of the Village is comparable to an act of vandalism. Once the sand has been extracted, what sureties do we have that the site will be restored as in objective 5. and what body will oversee this restoration?</p>
Individual	<p>We are now officially suffering the worst drought for over 100 years. A recent hydrology report highlighted the loss of 1.6 million gallons of water daily from park pit, pumped directly from the aquifer and discharged into the river Mole as waste, causing long term damage to the local water table. Common field is close to landfill sites which have already leached into the local water supply (Shagbrook) causing contamination and requiring the water supply (Shagbrook) having to be lined to greater depth at considerable cost and possible damage to the users of the water prior it lining. Extraction in common field could again require the water table to be lowered causing the leaching of toxins from nearby landfill sites (e.g. pebble hill). Common field is a breeding ground for skylarks which are in global decline and additionally is an area of natural beauty which would be blighted for generations for a gain of only a modest quantity of aggregate.</p>

Individual	We are living in a crisis zone. A recent hydrology report highlighted the loss of 1.6 million gallons of water daily from park pit and the long term damage this is causing the local water table. Common field is close to landfills which have already leached (Shagbrook) into the local water supply causing contamination and extraction in common field could risk a leaching of toxins from the nearby pebble hills. The skylarks on common field will be consigned to death and this area of national beauty will be blighted for generations to extract modest amounts of aggregate.
Individual	We already have a sand quarry on our doorstep. If we have the common field dug up, we will be virtually surrounded by quarrying. Can we be certain that the cracks appearing now in our property is not due to the local quarrying? What about the water table to build the area, because of 1.6 million galleons of water being pumped as waste by park pit just 1.5 kms away from us.
Individual	<p>There seems to be a lack of environmental assessment on the sites in the plan, the council laying the ones on residents or the developers, neither of which is satisfactory. The factors that need investigating for this site are: - Hydrological impact - Effects on fauna, especially skylarks - Maintenance of footpaths and bridleways - Effect on minor roads for access to quarry site. I have completed and enclosed the response form on the above plan but I am additionally writing to express my views on the plan and the consultation.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to reiterate my concerns raised in my previous correspondence on the Common Field site, Betchworth. I am a resident of Brockham and live in one of the properties which back directly onto the possible extraction site between Brockham and Betchworth. There are a number of issues that I feel have not been adequately investigated or addressed by the plan: • The footpath which borders the field is used by large numbers of walkers, residents of both villages and, particularly important, children going to both village schools. This is an ancient footpath that I believe is mentioned in the Domesday Book and is currently the safest route between the villages due to the lack of pavements on the country roads. • The roads that lead to and border this site are small country roads with no pavements and will be totally unsuitable for heavy plant and large lorries that, presumably, will be needed to remove the sand. • The open aspect of the countryside will be destroyed by any extraction activity and any protective bund. Because the countryside is so open, any extraction will be highly visible. • The impact on the flora and fauna of the field. The field is home to nesting skylarks and seasonally to greylag geese. I assume that there will be a full environmental impact assessment. Proposals for how extraction will cope with the mains sewer and Transco gas me that cross the field. In addition to these issues, should the site remain in the plan and subsequently be de eloped, my key concern will be what happens to the site after extraction.</p> <p>Objective 5 purports to address this but leaves it very open ended. I am concerned that any extraction site would then be used for landfill and, once this had been done, would then be left open to being classified a brownfield site and open for eg industrial development. There appears to be a big clue to this in the name of your department ie Minerals (dig a big hole), Waste (fill it with rubbish) & County Council Development (then build on it). This precisely what happened nearby at what is now Barley Mow Court. This last concern links to my second area of concern regarding the consultation process. The short summary paper sent out by post seems deliberately designed to allow Surrey County Council to say that most residents agree with their plan. By asking if we agree with the very noble objectives (which no-one is going to disagree with as stand alone objectives) it allows you to say that the majority of residents agree with your proposed plan. What it does not say is whether the sites should be in the plan at all. There are also caveats on all the objectives that appear to allow any developers to wriggle out of meeting these objectives.</p>
Individual	<p>I do not agree with the five objectives because they are merely gateways to the destruction of our countryside, community and way of life.</p> <p>Objective 1. Reducing demand for minerals. The demand has been fuelled largely by the needs of the Olympic games. What a curse those games are threatening to be on our community. Recycling is a good idea of course.</p> <p>Objective 2. Safeguarding the supply of minerals. How is digging up our beautiful countryside ‘safeguarding the supply of minerals’? Why hasn’t</p>

	<p>the importing of minerals from abroad been investigated and published? Objective 3. Minimising adverse impacts on communities and the environment from mineral development. Speak to the old people, the residents of Atkinson House, Betchworth, who already have a quarry to the rear of them and will soon have a quarry to the side of them as planning permission has already been granted. Speak to them if permission is granted for mineral extraction from the Common Field which is in front of them. Ask them if objective No 3 has been successful. Objective 4. Minimising adverse impacts from the transportation of minerals. We've heard that one before. Old School Lane, Brockham used to be a tiny single track country road until they found oil nearby. Their lorries were not going to affect that road either. Residents of Old Barley Mow Court, Buckland know all about commercial lorries working all hours of the day and night. They are woken at 1 a.m. as one lorry driver parks for the night. They are then woken up at 5 a.m. by another driver starting the morning shift and running his engine. These are lorries serving the quarry at Capel. These are the same lorries that crash through the narrow streets of Betchworth, exceeding the speed limit and on occasions smashing into garden walls as they thunder past. How much worse it will be if quarrying starts in the Common Field, in the heart of our community. Objective 5. Restoring mineral workings to the highest standards. Objective 1 cancels out Objective 5. Once building materials are recycled, there is no clean infill for restoring quarry sites. The only alternatives will be to infill with domestic waste or to leave a huge hole. These alternatives are not 'to the highest standards'. There is not enough material to restore the existing quarries to the highest standards. It is clear you cannot achieve your objectives in respect of this site, particularly Objectives 3 and 4. Therefore, I request that the Common Field be removed permanently from the Plan.</p>
Individual	<p>I am an only child and I have the most to lose, it is my environment that you are going to destroy. This pit will be in the centre of our lovely village. This is inappropriate. We will not be able to put up with the pollution, noise and dust and the hole will pose a serious threat to children due to the close proximity to residential homes. If you do not start filling up the existing holes the poor pensioners in Atkinson house will be surrounded on all sides by blight. It is a step too far. Please ensure that PMZ55 is not quarried.</p>
Individual	<p>We are regular visitors to the Betchworth area from Australia and we are appalled to learn of the real possibility of sand pits/quarries being developed in the heart of beautiful Betchworth. We feel very strongly that such development would severely downgrade and visually pollute this magnificent and special countryside. It is hard to believe that British officials who have such a fine record in conservation and preservation could allow such destruction. From our observation environment issues such as degradation of the water table and water quality, air and noise pollution caused by heavy machinery and transport, further congestion on local roads and effects on wildlife, if considered properly and responsibly would not support any argument or decision for the scheme to go ahead. We are informed that all local residents are strongly against the proposal and hence we humbly request that in the interests of such people and for future generations that you adhere to their wishes.</p>
Individual	<p>Please would you seriously consider my objections to sand quarrying in Brockham and Betchworth and kindly acknowledge receipt of this letter. I am a reasonably committed citizen in respect of the conservation of nature resources i.e. for the last 24 years I have maximised composting, grown plants, supported wildlife and largely reused furniture and used building materials and never used a sprinkler hose for my lawn. I therefore feel I have many rights to request that my local village should not suffer others greed and wastefulness and should have their beauty and tranquillity maintained. Above all I ask that: 1. The use of outrageous amounts of water used in the extraction of sand and gravel must be reduced, as the UK cannot afford this wastage. 2. Sustainable methods of building are implemented forthwith to reduce the use of extracted minerals. Surrey could be model implementations of such planning.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing to express my strongest possible objection to the inclusion of the Betchworth Common Field in the Surrey Minerals Plan. There are major reasons for doing so. They are as follows:</p>

	<p>Water - The impact of quarrying on water resources. Park Pit, another quarrying site little more than 1.5 kilometres away from Betchworth Common Field, is pumping and wasting 1.6 million gallons of water a day into the river Mole. This waste of water has to stop now if water resources are to be preserved for domestic supplies.</p> <p>Pollution - The Common Field is about 1.25 kilometres due south of the Pebble Hill landfill site which sits on the chalk aquifer. Quarrying below this site could result in areas of contaminated open water, threatening the safety of nearby residents and widening the contamination of the environment and the nearby river Mole.</p> <p>Traffic – HGV traffic would necessarily increase enormously to satisfy the transport needs of any additional quarry in the area. The resulting increase in traffic on the already crowded A25 and roads through Reigate leading to the M25 would have an almost catastrophic impact on business and local people alike. Inevitable accidents on all the main roads would result in chaos on the surrounding country lanes, at best. At worst people would certainly be involved in serious accidents as locals, commuters and HGVs attempted to rush to their destinations. Local back roads are already extremely dangerous, especially during rush hours. Walkers, bicyclists and horseback riders would be in particular danger on the very narrow country roads.</p> <p>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – The Betchworth Common Field is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This area’s beauty is enjoyed by many thousands of people every year. Most of that number is comprised of visitors from towns and cities in the UK. Allowing yet another quarry in this area would have a terrible impact on present and future generations for decades to come ... or even longer. It is vital that the deciding powers in this consideration remember that AoNBs were created for a purpose</p>
Individual	<p>With reference to the above, I wish to register an objection to the inclusion of the this site in any plans for mineral extraction. Further to my letter dated 20th October 2004 to The Minerals Plan Team, where I gave details of various serious issues concerning The Common Field (to which incidentally I received an acknowledgment - but no actual response on the points raised) and my feedback and comments provided in April this year to the ‘Additional Sites’ questions raised by SCC’s Minerals & Waste team, I wish to add the following please. I was recently staggered to find out that, despite the recently imposed drought order, the company operating - the existing local sand pit known as Park Pit, close to the A25 between Reigate and Dorking, is using water as part of its sand extraction process. The water is extracted from the ground, processed and then dumped into the local river. The volume of water taken out of the ground and thrown away is up to 1.6 million gallons a day. This has had a very serious impact on the local water table and has also caused Sutton & East Surrey Water all sorts of problems, resulting in them digging deeper bore holes, getting less water out of the ground and cleaning up contaminated water, etc. Should you allow extraction of sand to take place in The Common Field at Betchworth, it will involve further excavation below the natural water line, resulting in even more water being drained from the surrounding land. In my view, this environmental damage is totally unacceptable – in fact I believe the existing operations in the immediate area have already caused irreversible damage to the environment and at a minimum, should be curtailed or at least surcharged, while the drought order is in effect – but that is really another issue, which I have already brought to the attention of The Secretary of State for the Environment. Further mineral extraction in the Betchworth & Buckland area should not be allowed at any site. In particular, the ‘green field’ site of The Common Field should not be included, as further damage to an already seriously impacted local water table would become an environmental catastrophe. I trust this objection is clear. If you require any further details please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Individual	<p>I wrote to you on 27th January 2005 objecting to the inclusion of PMZ 60, Shagbrook Buckland and PMZ 55 (then known as Land south of the Old Reigate Road) in the Surrey Mineral Development Framework. I am now writing to reiterate that I OBJECT to the inclusion of the Common Field at Betchworth – PMZ55 in the Surrey Minerals Plan Review Preferred Option Consultation. As a reminder, our family home is next to the extended section of Tapwood Pit. I write, therefore, not as a ‘Nimby’ but with genuine concern based on our own experience of the impact from</p>

	<p>current quarry workings which is significant. Technical assessments on water abstraction in the area show the damage which is being caused by the quarrying activity in the region. There is probability of contamination of water if PMZ55 goes ahead – surely this is an unacceptable pollution risk to residents and also to the environment in the vicinity of the River Mole? Surrey County Council makes significant PR in its publication ‘Surrey Matters’ about a positive strategy for the delicate ecology in the area. How can that be reconciled with the risk of destroying a breeding ground habitat for the protected Skylark? Why run projects to encourage diversity of wildlife? I object to the fact that the inevitable disruption of quarrying will hasten the decline of this rare species.</p> <p>1. I object to PMZ55 on Health grounds and that it will create ill health from airborne sand for residents who, to date, have not had quarry works behind their homes. Airborne sand from Tapwood settles across our land and property. I object on the grounds of the long-term visual impact and blight of the quarry which will be a scar on the landscape. The Common Field is a stunning area bordering an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and an Area of Great Landscape Value. Our experience with the expansion of Tapwood is that we now have a huge sand pit in front of our home visible from all north-facing windows. The sightline is ugly and trees in the area are suffering from drought and dying – I am happy to show you. New planting carried out to thicken the inadequate woodland left at Tapwood has mostly died, so there is no reason to believe this would be better in Betchworth. I object on the grounds of noise disturbance from various activities. We live on the edge of the A25 towards Reigate, and the increase in HGV movement which would be created by this proposed site to reach the M25 is not acceptable on grounds of health and noise. The planting of bunds is not effective in masking noise and there is no workable solution for properties so close to PMZ55 to avoid noise disturbance from extraction. I object on the grounds that there is no guaranteed option for the Restoration or Restitution programme in the future. It is not clear once the mineral has been won whether Betchworth will face Landfill or a possible recycling site to fill the hole. I object on the grounds of loss of public amenity and area of recreation for residents and especially all our children in the Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland area. Having 2 sons of my own, it is hard to know where is left for children to meander – without the risk of trespassing on a quarry I know that Mineral Zones are classed as ‘Bad Neighbour developments’ along with Sewage treatment and Power stations. Betchworth surely cannot be accused of not having its fair share of quarries and landfill. Is there not an argument that the prospect of further industrial activity in our rural area conflicts with the Sustainable Communities strategy? It would be untenable if the higher government target production of 2.62m tonnes for Surrey is in any way to supply the Olympic Village. In a letter from our MP Sir Paul Beresford on 25th February 2005, he reassured me that he is very aware of PMZ55 and opposed to the listing within the Mineral Development Plan. At that time he was keeping in close contact with County Councillor Mrs. Helyn Clack who he stated as pivotal to resisting these decisions. I am copying both Sir Paul Beresford and Mrs Clack on this letter.</p> <p>2 Once again, it seems futile to go to a protracted planning process for a site that seems to have genuine issues over its viability – for the cost financially and in stress to all residents concerned. Please arrange for me to be notified at the address above when the Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and also of the adoption of the plan. I hope this letter adequately states my objection and that, alongside many others, it will persuade you to withdraw PMZ55 as a preferred option in the next stage of consultation and permanently from future plans. We are delighted at the decision you took to withdraw PMZ6O and look forward to your decision in favour of withdrawal of PMZ55.</p>
Individual	<p>Even though some amendments have been made to the area that has been proposed as a potential sand quarry, we are still writing to object totally to the appalling application by Lord Hamilton, to start quarrying for sand in Betchworth Common Field. It seems inconceivable that 45 acres of protected, and extremely beautiful, land can even be considered as a possible site for excavations that will take 10 years at least to complete. This land is historic. It is in a Conservation Area. It will remove not only the exquisite views that villagers and ramblers have loved for centuries, but it will also remove an ancient path between Brockham and Betchworth. It is environmental vandalism of the most despicable kind. We, in this area, have already contributed a huge area of land to quarrying. We are being asked to accept that another unacceptable scar of ugliness is to be scoured</p>

	<p>into our already suffering landscape. Squeezing yet more out of an already over- quarried area. It is monstrously greedy, and completely unacceptable. If this quarry goes ahead, we will all be affected. The destruction will be unimaginable. Nothing can disguise or ameliorate the impact. Three historic and beautiful villages – Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland – will all be damaged by this work, (because Buckland will probably be quarried eventually). The impact will mean extra pollution, noise, damage to the environment, increased traffic and filth, unacceptable hazards with huge lorries hammering down roads that were not built for them. We do not want another road built just so that the lorries can convey their loads. The landfill that inevitably follows will leach toxins into the River Mole. What will happen to the water levels? What will happen to the wild life of our beautiful river and its banks? What about the dangers to our children? We have so many children in this area. What about the effect that all the noise and pollution and dust and dirt will have on the schoolchildren who will be working in their school right next to the quarry?? It's an insane idea, with no benefit whatsoever to the people of the villages and make the people who live in them suffer from all the horrendous problems it will bring us, for all those years and beyond. Presumably once the landfill is finished, houses will be built, which will mean even more money for the conglomerate exploiting this land. This is Green Belt country. How can you allow what's left of our beautiful area to be destroyed so blatantly? Once it is taken away, it can never, ever return. It will be destroyed for all time. For what? Or rather, for whose financial gain?? It is a fact that it is cheaper to buy the sand from Belgium, so in heaven's name, why on earth is this even being proposed? Unless it is to make one man extremely rich, to the cost of thousands of other people's quality of life. It will drastically reduce their financial standing, for which they have worked all their lives, as their property values plunge. Does that seem fair? Is that acceptable? No, it absolutely is not. We cannot sacrifice an irreplaceable, and exquisite piece of our countryside, just so that a few extremely greedy people can benefit. The chaos and destruction of the people's lives in these villages should be glaringly obvious should this horrendous proposal go ahead. We have paid our dues in this area concerning aggregates for the country. Enough is enough. NO MORE OF OUR PRECIOUS GREEN BELT LAND, OUR CONSERVATION AREA AND OUR PROTECTED VILLAGES SHOULD BE DESTROYED.</p>
Individual	<p>I write to object to the proposed workings of Betchworth Common Field. Objections 1. Skylarks The field is a rare habitat for Skylarks. The following is official information from the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds; 'Skylarks are now on the 'Red List' in "Birds and Conservation Concern 2002-2007" which for this species indicates a decline of in excess of 50% in population over the last 25 years.' The Skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife Act of 1981 which makes it an offence to damage or destroy an active nest or it's contents. The only exception is legitimate FARMING practices that cannot be reasonably delayed. The existing farming practices have allowed the Skylark population to exist in this location for many generations. Indeed the old house opposite the field next to Betchworth Post Office is called Lark Field. The current population and those before it focus in numbers in the North I North East section of Common Field- EXACTLY the area proposed for Quarrying. These birds will only nest in open fields and as they nest in the open they rely purely on vigilance to protect themselves and their young. The current farming of the Common Field allows for rotation of crops I allowing periods where the land will lay 'fallow' I allowing crops to be sprayed while constantly maintaining a 'wildlife friendly' stance. The removal of the North I North East section of this field will have dramatic impact upon the Skylarks. The one area these birds nest will be destroyed and the remaining 'open field' (but now with hedges and bunds) will not reflect their nesting habitat. Finally (on birds!) one of the many reasons so many walkers enjoy the track (that links the North Downs Way) is that it runs straight through the Skylarks territory allowing visitors to witness these rare birds hovering high overhead singing their very distinct song. If you require official numbers of breeding pairs present in the field please contact me and I will forward records. These birds exist! If your reports indicate otherwise in this enquiry you will be party to misinformation. 2. Hydrology Evidence exists that should the water table in the area ever return to 'natural' levels (when the pumping of 1.6 million gallons of water a day at Park Pit is eventually stopped- probably by pressure from CAMEL I the public) the table will encroach into the lower section of any infill placed in the proposed pit in Betchworth Field. Surrey County</p>

	<p>Council have already admitted they do not have the resource to 'police' what actually goes in as infill- it will be on 'the word' of the contractor. We must assume that anything could (and will) go into this site and it will be impossible for S.C.C. to guarantee to residents that it will only consist of 'inert' infill. Track history with the developer (Franks) clearly indicates that S.C.C. neither has the resource nor the skills levels to effectively manage Franks existing or continuing operations. Case-in- point is the illegal (unofficial) recycling facility that Franks ran for ten years unchallenged, resulting in an unchallenged license to operate officially without restriction I current applications for the erection of a warehouse to recycle rubbish. It is time to stand up to this developer. 3. Landscape The Betchworth Common Field is one of the last open field systems (no hedges) in Surrey. It is enjoyed by thousands of walkers per annum as an accessible space to escape and reflect / enjoy the views of Leith Hill and the North Downs. This field is IN THE MIDDLE OF A COMMUNITY and the open vista means we can see our neighbours' properties I maintain the village as an entire community. An 'outsider' may consider that the field is on the outskirts of the village (i.e.. not next to the pub I church) but it is the very openness of the field that enables the entire village to consider itself a single community. If the quarry is excavated and bunds go in place the Northern section of the village will be instantly cut off I isolated from the Southern section. Many in the village rely upon the help and assistance of friends / do not possess cars and use the track and path across the field as their only means of access. I have seen the proposed path schemes and consider them a very poor substitute to the current layout and quite possibly higher risk of crime due to the isolation I bunds. Bear in mind Betchworth has no street lighting in the majority of the parish- this is something to be preserved and would be under severe pressure once people complain about the dark path access that would result. 4. Transport The volume of HGV Transport from the proposed site will have major impact upon the surrounding area. The A23 already has a high accident rate outside the existing Franks Quarry and there is no reason to believe that the extra volume of movements will not result in reduced road quality in terms of debris and damage to the actual surface. During construction there would be massive implications in terms of local diversions, HGV movements past a school bus stop / post-office and the inevitable compromising of traffic-flow I knock-on effects to the surrounding area. This location is not in the middle of nowhere! It is in the heart of a village and at the hub of a very busy commuter route for motorists wishing to avoid the main roads I heading North I South. Impact during construction of 'the tunnel' will be large. If the tunnel does not manifest itself all the traffic will hit the village I clash for space down a narrow country lane with existing HGV movements from the (unmanaged by S.C.C.) Barley Mow yard. I am not a NIMBY! I understand the need for natural resources but remain totally unconvinced that the Surrey County Council has registered how totally inappropriate this site is for the removal of such material. I also believe (as does the press I public) that past, present and future demand for such materials has been conceived with absolutely no consideration for the environmental impact of the regions ear-marked for quarrying. The process is unsustainable in this region and needs to be brought to a natural conclusion - finish the extraction in existing works I address Franks' free-reign to do anything he likes and fulfil your promise to reinstate the plethora of open pits back to countryside / farmland.</p>
Individual	<p>On 29th October 2004, I wrote to David Lamb, then Team Leader - Minerals and Waste Policy and Plans, with detailed objections to the proposal to extract sand from the Common Field site at Betchworth Reference PMZ 55. The latest revision of your Minerals Development Plan, by reducing the size of the site, has partially addressed some of these technical objections but most remain valid including the impact of quarrying on the local environment, the problems of traffic management and the long term problem of ensuring any form of effective restoration of a site in the middle of Green Belt land and close to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I enclose a copy of that letter as the points that it raises continue to be valid today and they do not appear to have been taken into consideration by your current team. However, since I last wrote a further technical problem for the extraction of sand has become nationally relevant. Surrey and most of the South East of England is currently under a Drought Order. The shortage of water in the area is likely to continue for many years into the future because of inadequate provision and maintenance of resources in the past, the escalating usage of water by individual households and the pressure for more new homes in the South East. Sand extraction impacts</p>

directly on the hydrology of the local area and the sand itself needs to be washed to make it usable. The water shortage itself should cause the Government to review its drive to increase population in the South East. It should also cause you to question the Government about its policy of producing materials for the increased building locally with the result that you have a government-imposed quota to fulfil for extraction. I welcome the opportunity given to me for democratic debate on this matter; I wait to see whether it is local democracy or big government that prevails. Mineral Development Consultation Exercise – PMZ55 Surrey County Council has invited inputs from the general public in the formulation of the County Mineral Development Framework. I welcome this opportunity and, trusting that this is a genuine extension of local democracy and not a mere cosmetic exercise, I am pleased to send you my initial comments. I understand that at this stage the Minerals Plan Team is seeking technical comments only. It is difficult to define precisely these categories but I have attempted to restrict my comments below to the same areas as have been addressed in the first edition of your report “Assessment of Potential Mineral Zones for Extraction of Sand and Gravel in Surrey”. I should like to be placed on your mailing list for future contact as the consultation process proceeds, as I believe that I will have a contribution to make on matters outside the purely technical. My comments address first the specific points covered by your report and secondly other matters, which I believe, should also be considered. I have commented primarily on PMZ55 because this is an area about which I have specific knowledge but several of my comments could equally apply to all of the Mole Valley Potential Zones. Comments on the report “Assessment of Potential Mineral Zones” 55.1 Core Details. 55.1 Surrounding Uses. This section states that the village of Betchworth is approximately 300 m to the East. In fact, Betchworth is a linear village in approximately cruciform shape. It extends to Pebble Hill to the North, just beyond the Red Lion on the Old Reigate Road to the East, over the river Mole to the South and to Elm Villas and Barley Mow Court along the Old Reigate Road to the West. The Post Office and bus stop on the Old Reigate Road lie on the approximate geographical centre of the village. They abut directly on to the PMZ, as does Atkinson House providing sheltered accommodation for the elderly. The church and village conservation area lie on the centre line to the South, as do the village school and its playing field. The latter abuts directly onto the PMZ. The proposed PMZ thus lies in the heart of the village, albeit a section that is undeveloped and Green Belt to this date. I hope to show later that this area is the green “lung” of the village used for recreation by visitors and villagers alike. 55.1 Planning Policy. While it is correct to say that the land is designated as Green Belt only, it should be made clear that the zone lies in the midst of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The AONBs and Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLVs) are not contiguous within the Surrey Hills Area and the rights of way through the adjoining Green Belt are used by pedestrians and others enjoying recreation in this area of National Heritage. This feature should have been highlighted and discussed as a Key Issue and Mitigation. 55.1 Landscape and Visual. There is a landscape consideration associated with the closely adjacent Conservation Area. This is discussed later. 55.1 Other Environmental Issues. In addition to the electricity cable, a LHP gas main traverses the area from North to South and a MP gas main and water drain lies diagonally along Kiln Lane. The rights of way include a footpath from the Post Office and bus stop to the Conservation Area, a bridle way along a parallel route and Kiln Lane a public highway and bus route link with the village of Brockham. These should have been highlighted and discussed under Key Issues and Mitigation. 55.2 Key Issues. 55.2 Transport. Mention should have been made of Kiln Lane that is the main link between the villages of Betchworth and Brockham and is the only local bus route serving the residents of both villages travelling to Guildford, Reigate, Redhill and Dorking. The importance of the footpath as a pedestrian link within Betchworth should have been considered. This is discussed later as is the importance of the bridle path. 55.2 Noise. As well as noise, consideration should be given to dust pollution and the impact of works during subsequent restoration of the site to Green Belt. 55.3 Mitigation. 55.3 Noise. The footpath to the East of the Zone is a vital pedestrian link between the Post Office, Atkinson House and bus stop at the centre of the village and the Church and Dolphin public house in the Conservation Area to the South. It also runs directly past the school and provides access to it. The other North-South link in Betchworth is The Street. This carries considerable traffic including goods vehicles “rat running” to Gatwick airport. It has only a narrow and

sloping footpath whilst past the school on The Street side, there is no footpath at all and the carriageway is bounded by a high brick wall. The footpath adjoining the Zone is thus the only viable pedestrian link between the centre and southern arm of the village. Erection of a 4 m bund along the Eastern boundary of the Zone as proposed, would turn the foot path, which currently enjoys open views over fields to the North Downs AONB, into an enclosed alley way. The line of sight along the footpath would be lost and it would create anxiety and a potential hazard of attack for the vulnerable such as children, disabled and elderly. At present, the highest feature in the Zone is a 2 m high bus shelter at the North East corner. The bund would be twice as high and would form a continuous barrier to the open views of surrounding AONBs enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. It would have a significant visual impact on the whole area. If special consideration is needed for the school so that noisier operations are conducted during school holidays or out of school hours, similar consideration should be shown for the occupants of Atkinson House sheltered accommodation - but they do not have the opportunity of escaping "during school holidays or out of school hours". Preliminary Planning Assessment. 55.4 The Old Reigate Road has traditionally been un-hedged in this area. Some hedging has recently been installed by either the landowner or the quarry owner to the North, presumably in speculative anticipation of the outcome of your current study. Most of the road is still unhedged and affords excellent views onto the North Downs AONB. The importance of the public right of way along the Eastern boundary has already been discussed. The parallel track is a bridle way that serves many purposes for locals and visitors. It forms one of the main connecting pedestrian links between the North Downs AONB and several AGLVs to the South. It is used regularly by hikers, pedestrians, joggers and dog walkers. It was also used by the local landowner to provide access for the construction of a weir and hydroelectric plant on the River Mole. It may seem insignificant on a plan but it is an integral part of the infrastructure needed for enjoyment of the heritage of the Surrey Hills. Kiln Lane bisects the zone diagonally. It provides the main link between the closely related villages of Betchworth and Brockham and is the route of the local bus. If the zone is quarried, either Kiln Lane will disappear or it will run directly through the workings and a further tunnel will be needed to allow material to be brought to the southern sector and thence to the existing separate quarry to the North of Old Reigate Road. As indicated previously, LHP & MP gas mains and water drains also lie beneath the Zone. 55.5 Having walked the area many times, I am not clear about the comment that the contours of the land restrict views from the South. I understand that to date your report has been based on a desk study. I suggest that your officers assess the facts about the views in person. Any screening from the brow, as described, might conceal the workings of the quarry to the North of Old Reigate Road but it is not high enough to affect the views of the North Downs AONB. 55.6 The suggestion of a tunnel under Old Reigate Road, and by implication under Kiln Lane as well, is superficially attractive but is unlikely to be viable. Access is required not only for material removed from the Zone to the quarry to the North but also for plant and machinery (e. g. earth moving plant, piling machinery, cranes etc.) to move into the Zone. Unless the tunnel were adequately sized it would not serve this purpose and a simple conveyor link would not be suitable at all. As this is a technical study at this stage, I believe that the Council should consider the technically optimum solution that is likely to be sought by developers of a new quarry who will have economic and commercial priorities. The operators would require a surface link and I suggest that consideration should be given to a roundabout or traffic light controlled crossing at a junction just to the South of Old Reigate Road and Kiln Lane. This would also serve the purpose of providing access to the area of the Zone to the North of Kiln Lane. Although the environmental impact would be greater than a tunnel, it is better that it should be considered as a probability at this stage rather than to discover that "planning creep" has allowed its introduction at a later date. I am sure that the Council is well aware of the difficulties of enforcing compliance with planning conditions against the pressure of commercial imperatives. 55.7 Why has this treatment been recommended for properties to the West of the Zone that are already approximately 80 m from its boundary? Surely properties to the North and East, including the Post Office, school and Atkinson House, which abut directly onto the zone, deserve similar consideration. As indicated above, the 4 m high bund would have a significant impact and would create a hazard along the school path. 55.9 The comments that I have made above

	<p>about the position of the Zone in relation to the village show that working of the Zone would have a significant impact on the daily lives of the villagers and on the amenities enjoyed by visitors to the Surrey Hills heritage. The proposed tree belts would impact directly on the excellent views onto the North Downs. 55.10 This statement does not agree with your officer at the public meeting held in Dorking on 19 October 2004. He said that nothing was included in or out at this stage. I suggest that it is premature to include the Zone in the MOE and that further consideration should be given to the points above and those that follow. Fig 37. Please note that this Figure does not agree with the Zone defined on Plan PMZ55. The Plan has been taken as the correct version in my comments above. Additional matters not covered by the Report 1. Relationship of the Zone to Surrey Hills AONB The Zone stands in the midst of the Surrey Hills AONB and provides much used Green Belt pedestrian links between designated AONBs and AGLVs close by. For example, to the North there is an AGLV within 300 m and an AONB within 500 m. To the West there is an AGLV within 1.1 km and a Conservation Area within 500 m to the South West. Most important, there is an AGLV less than 500 m to the South and a Conservation Area only about 180 m from the southern boundary of the Zone. The bridle way provides a direct link between the historic heritage footpaths of the Pilgrims Way and the Greensand Way. 2. Consideration of Conservation Area. The northern boundary of the Betchworth village Conservation Area lies only 180 m from the southern boundary of the Zone. On the subject of Development in Conservation Areas, ENV39 states "Development in Conservation Areas, or adjacent to and affecting their setting, shall preserve and enhance the character of the Area". In a further sub-clause it states "4. Significant views into and out of Conservation Areas will be safeguarded". A mineral working within 180 m of the Conservation Area and directly in line with its view onto the Surrey Hills AONB, cannot comply with this requirement. 3. Noise and Pollution. The Report mentions the possibility of noise pollution but has not considered dust pollution. From experience of quarries near by, and acceptable, there is likely to be a problem with dust under certain weather conditions. It is proposed that both noise and dust levels should be monitored continuously to an acceptable environmental standard and that records of the levels monitored should be available for inspection by the Council's environmental officers. 4. Restoration of the Site The Report for this Zone omits any consideration of restoration of the site after quarrying has finished. Although many years in the future, it is important that the site should be restored to Green Belt agricultural use. With its strategic position within the Surrey Hills, it would not be acceptable if it were turned into a leisure park, housing estate, or industrial site. Experience has shown that this is often the fate of old mineral workings although there are exceptions. Betchworth Quarry to the North of the village is one of the exceptions but it has not been free of problems. With the general trend towards preservation of the Environment, and particularly Heritage sites, land fill may not be an acceptable option in the future, but some form of being -land fill will be the only way to return the Zone to Green Belt. The impact on the village of the necessary workings to restore the site, and the cost, must be considered at the same time as the quarrying. I trust that these comments will be helpful to you and will be given proper consideration. As indicated above, I should very much like to be kept informed of future progress in formulating the MDF with respect to the Mole Valley and Surrey Hills.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing to ask you and your colleagues to reconsider the application for sand extraction from the Common Field. It is one of Surreys' most outstanding beautiful areas and plays a giant part in the life and soul of Betchworth, I have listed below some relevant points:1 The field is bordered by houses on four sides including a school, shop and post office and an old people's home. 2 The bridle path and foot path are heavily used by locals, school children, riders and tourists. The area is also surrounded by conservation areas. 3 Danger of contmimi1ion from adjacent landfill sites spreading into the River Mole with the aide of the proposed sand quarry. 4 Total destruction of wildlife habitat in and around the Common Field by digging, noise and bunds. 5 Traffic through Betchworth is increasing. Lorries will create chaos particularly when the village shop is open where parking in the road means one lane traffic. School parking in Old Reigate Road and The Street creates an additional problem. There is considerable local anger and concern. When my Husband and I purchased our house we paid a premium for living in such a special area, but with all the surrounding pits and if the Common Field is included Betchworth local's property will be severely devalued and it will be likened</p>

	to living in a rubbish tip. Hopefully the Common Field development will be turned down.
Individual	Minerals, Waste & County Development I have just returned from a walk around The Common Field on a glorious sunny Sunday morning. The view across the field and towards the Surrey Hills is quite stunning and I realised that this view will not exist, indeed, the walk via the footpath, which runs parallel to The Street, across the field at the bottom by The Walled Garden, and back to Old Reigate Road on the bridleway, will not exist. In all the information I have read and been told regarding the proposed inclusion of this area within the Surrey Minerals Plan, there has been no information regarding the bridleway and it's continued use. This site is of historical interest, called "The Common Field" because of use by all villagers for growing their own produce. This is why it is such a large, unfenced or hedged field, obviously this use declined over time and the field was taken back by The Estate for commercial growing of crops. Perhaps you could enlighten me as to the fate of the Bridleway should the proposal to work this site succeed. I am also very concerned at the impact of any workings on The Common Field with regard to our depleted water resources. The local water supply has already been contaminated by the workings at Shagbrook and we have the potential pollution threat from the Betchworth land fill site on Pebble Hill. You will be aware that Surrey County Council failed to ensure that this site was monitored to ensure the correct type of waste was deposited there and it is common knowledge that we have a pollution time bomb sitting there which will adversely effect our children and our grandchildren! The Common Field is a recognised breeding site for the Skylark, a bird which is increasingly under threat, any working of this site will further exacerbate this decline. Betchworth and it's narrow, twisting roads is used as a short cut to Gatwick Airport and between 7am and about 6.30pm on any week day the traffic roaring through is more than the roads were ever built for. To add further to this traffic would create a very dangerous situation for all residents and in particular for The Acorns School and the pupils who attend. The rear of the School and indeed the footpath to which I referred earlier, are immediately adjacent to the potential workings, with all the noise, fumes and dust they would create. Is this really what we want our legacy to our children to be? I would ask' you to consider carefully removing this site from the Minerals Plan on the grounds of 1. Visual impact to the surrounding landscape 2. Effect on water resources in the vicinity 3. Pollution 4. Increased traffic 5. Damage to wildlife, in particular to the habitat of the Skylark 6. The general well being of the more than 150 people each day who use the Common Field and its environs as a means of recreation (walking the dog, visit the Pub, access to school, walk to Church, etc, etc, etc)
Individual	I strongly object to the quarrying of the Common 'Field PMZ55. I have 3 children who will be living in close proximity to tile proposed quarry. It is too close to our homes, our shops and our schools. 'The pollution will impact our lives and damage our children's health. There wilt be increased traffic through the village regardless of anything the contractor says. He will pursue his own agenda as he has done over many years as you are powerless and under resourced to do anything about it. He now has industrial use for tire area alongside the existing pit because you did not challenge him for 10 years. An omission that proves you do not have the resources to police quarry activity at all. Why hasn't the existing quarry been filled? Where is all the inert waste going to come from?. Please ensure that PMZ55 is not quarried.
Individual	I write to convey my outrage that the Betchworth Common Field has been included in your Preferred Option Plan in spite of the very many objections, with good reasons, put by many of the villagers last year including my wife and myself 1. Through our association CAMEL you have been warned about the threat of depletion of the water table through the current Park Pit site which is extracting 1.6 million gallons of water a day into the river Mole, which represents twice the amount required for domestic use. 2. Even if the industrial and domestic water usage were to cease immediately and demand for water remain static it would still take another 20 years for the water table to recover and reach it's 1955 level with rainfall returning to normality. 3. Furthermore if Park Pit were to cease operations the water table would rise gradually, and thus the proposed extraction of sand from The Common Field would only become economic if sand were to be extracted from the raised water table level. Pumping

	<p>out the water would have to take place to extract sand and again it would deplete and waste water otherwise used for domestic purposes. We now have a drought order because of water shortage, and indeed Surrey and East Water have had to sink their boreholes deeper to counteract the waste from current extraction of sand, and you now want to make matters even worse by applying to the Government for extraction at our Common Field Site, consigning our village and adjacent Brockham Village to at least 40 year of dirt, noise, air pollution and general blight in an area of outstanding countryside. 4. I am advised that toxic leachates have released ammonia into the domestic water supply from the nearby Shagbrook landfill site and a similar situation is likely to occur at the Pebble Hill landfill site which sits on the chalk aquifer. This site is only 1.25km north of the Common Field and if excavation is permitted on this proposed village site then open water is likely to become contaminated and be a serious threat to the safety of nearby residents and a danger to the environment, as well as the possible contamination of the River Mole. 5. Transport of the sand from the proposed Common Field site would also be a cause for concern from the noise and pollution and traffic movement of heavy vehicles entering the A25 via the existing quarry, no doubt heading for the M25 which would add to yet more congestion and disruption. 6. Should the proposed quarry go ahead at the Common Field Site, in spite of all reasonable objections, what assurance can you give us that the subsequent landfill will be with non-toxic and inert materials? It is my belief that this is not the case with the other nearby landfill sites, and it is reasonable to request therefore that you publish your plan to monitor and enforce this essential safety policy for our future well being. 7. The existing quarry mentioned in 5 above has been expanding for the last decade and has not yet been restored, and yet further extensions to this site have been granted and will border on two sides the local dwellings and an old people's home. Adding a further proposed site, The Common Field, in front of the old people's home, thus surrounding it on three sides, would make life intolerable for the residents of the home and nearby villagers with houses facing the site and the school, as well as creating a blight on our local landscape, an area of outstanding Natural Beauty, sited between two conservation areas. 8. The proposed site if allowed as I have said in previous correspondence, would in conjunction with the already approved extension to the existing quarry be not only detrimental to the amenity of our area in usual and disruptive terms, but would also decimate the breeding ground of the skylark, an endangered species in global decline given the highest conservation priority by the RSPB. 9. Finally, if permitted development were granted, property values would plummet and village life be decimated for our inhabitants who all enjoy our countryside and footpaths with the tranquilities that Betchworth is famous for, not to mention Four Weddings and a Funeral in our beautiful listed Church. Indeed this proposed Common Field Site, if permitted, would present a fifth funeral on all of us. I look forward to your response.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing in relation to the proposed quarry site in Betchworth, Surrey. Firstly I would like to make it entirely clear that I am writing to highlight how appalled I am that these proposals have been put forward and such consideration be given to this particular site in Betchworth. My complete disapproval of this proposed quarry site is for many reasons. However with John Prescott's plans to build more "green belt" housing in the South, we probably do need more sandpits. Strange to me, but Betchworth isn't even going to provide building grade sand, but the silica sand used in chips and glass. So does Mole Valley need to excavate non-building grade sand at the expense of the environment, this is my concern and I certainly believe not. John Prescott has a clear dislike of South England, and you are only adding fuel to his fire. You know all the arguments against sandpits - extra noise, extra traffic and heavy goods vehicles and pollution and extra dust. Plus a reduction in the water table, when we are experiencing the driest times for many years. As far as quarrying goes, there are 'locations' and there are 'locations' – and right bang in between two picturesque villages, well, that's a 'first' in my book. I am writing to highlight my disapproval on the grounds that this proposed quarry and land fill site will be of absolutely no benefit to the local community and surrounding villages and villagers whatsoever. The proposed site is entirely green open fields, surrounded by housing and schools and almost precisely in between two quiet, quaint, quintessential English Surrey villages. We should be proud of our villages, we should seek to protect our villages, we are lucky that these villages exist. Betchworth and Brockham are situated in the Greenbelt, and in very close proximity to an area of outstanding natural beauty – namely the Surrey Hills and</p>

	<p>Boxhill. I believe the latter is protected by the European Parliament due to their special interest to conservation groups. I have wondered why the European Parliament would feel they need to be involved, but this is becoming evidently more obvious. If our own planning rules and regulations cannot be trusted, bring in Europe to safeguard us properly. I studied Surveying, Conservation and Planning at Kingston University a few years ago and am proud of my Degree and the course I studied at Kingston University. I am not proud of Surrey County Council and their plans with respect to quarrying and land fill in the County. I believe that it is Surrey County Council's duty to evaluate the proposals put forward by these developers, builders or excavators, whatever you want to call them and evaluate how these proposals will benefit the surrounding communities of Betchworth, Brockham and Buckland. This must surely be paramount in reaching a conclusion. There may be Parliamentary pressure on councils to give consideration to these quarry sites, but I believe Surrey Council should be able to decide whether these local proposals benefit the wider population of Surrey, rather than simply the owners of these sites such as JJ Franks. The latter will be the only one laughing if permission is granted. I would like to know what benefit, you believe this proposal to excavate tens of acres of green fields, then fill with rubbish, a location between two outstanding villages, an area of open fields, and of natural beauty, what benefit does this offer to Surrey? We are continually seeing increasing Press coverage regarding the issue of water and there being a shortage and hose pipe bans etc. Sandpits produce waste, the biggest waste is water. Millions of gallons of our water will be dumped every day into nearby rivers. We are being asked to conserve water and you proposing ways to waste it. Great, what a result! One land owner will benefit if the go ahead is given, and thousands of villagers around will be the losers. We as the community would be the ones who have our village dug up purely for the financial gain of one individual and the government. Surrey Council, please do not let this proposal to go ahead, on the specific grounds that this proposed quarry will be of absolutely no benefit to the local community. Assuming you are not desk bound Adrian, get yourself to Surrey to see exactly what is proposed and where. Take a look at the area, then tell me in writing what benefit there will be to our community. I only hope that JJ Franks has not lent money to the Labour Party. If he has, he may well already have bought the approval he seeks.</p>
Individual	<p>I wish to lodge my continuing objection to the inclusion of the Common Field Betchworth in the preferred options for the Surrey Minerals Plan. In my view the Common Field at Betchworth should be removed from the preferred options list for the following reasons: 1 Visual blight You only need to take one look at the existing quarries, particularly those adjacent to the A25 to see the dramatic effect it has on the area. I believe this is an area of great landscaping value and an area of outstanding natural beauty. The Common Field is sited between two conservation areas. The existing quarries look a complete mess, very little policing is done by Surrey County Council to improve the visual blight and no doubt the same thing will happen to the Common Field. 2. Water Resources Having been recently to a meeting of CAMEL, an organisation that I understand that you are familiar with. They have explained in detail the impact of quarrying on water resources and hydrology which I was completely unaware of. In view of the water restrictions now in place, bearing in mind that we are suffering the worst drought for some hundred years, quarrying in the area should be stopped altogether, and in particular the Common Field, should not take place. 3. The Environment The effect of Pollution and impact of toxic leachates which I understand release ammonia into the domestic water supply which could threaten the safety of nearby residents and widening the contamination of the environment and the nearby river Mole. 4. Wildlife The Common Field I understand is a breeding ground for skylarks which are given the highest conservation priority by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Quarrying will remove a vital area of land and the impact of noise and pollution will destroy this valuable habitat forever. 5. The local community The residents of the village, the effect of the quarry on adjacent and neighbouring properties and also Betchworth School. 6. Access The effect the quarry will have on traffic in the village. There will be significant volumes of HGV traffic and no doubt within the village itself. The roads in the village are totally unsuitable to HGV traffic. In addition, there is only very limited pavement access for pedestrians in the village.</p>

Individual	<p>I have carefully studied SCC report, "Surrey Minerals Plan, April 2006" which designates preferred sites for the extract of minerals. My comments refer in particular to the selection by SCC of Betchworth Common Field, "area O," 4.6 hectares. It is my opinion that the extract of minerals from this field is completely unacceptable and should be deleted from SCC preferred options for the following reasons. 1. SCC report states that "planning applications should address," surely present feasibility studies must enable SCC to take responsibility by being proscriptive in its direction of planning. SCC does not appear to have undertaken a sufficiently detailed study of the Common Field and the impact on Betchworth to enable a clearly defined and confident brief to prospective contractors or to persuade Betchworth of any merit. SCC policy report relating to the extract of minerals clearly states that SCC must be "pro-active" in the control of the extract of minerals to ensure that contractors for this work will undertake the extract procedures and in particular restoration to the required time scale and constraints. I consider it to be imperative that local impact, environmental damage and all practical implications of extract and restoration of Common Field are identified employing such specialist consultant advice as necessary; cost to SCC cannot be used as a factor, as SCC would in any case need to evaluate any planning proposal by a prospective contractor in the remote possibility that, after reconsideration, SCC decide to proceed. Negotiation on time and method without knowledge would lead to unacceptable compromise. 2. Key issues to be addressed in detail: i) Location SCC acknowledges and defines the location of the site as being on the western edge of Betchworth village. The location and relationship of Common Field to the village and its facilities differs in every respect from other mineral sites accessed from the A25 Reigate Road Quarries The Common Field is enjoyed and used as an integral part of the village, present farming activities are appropriate and enhance the landscape which would be destroyed by quarry activities and must be kept as an open farmed space. ii) Local Footpaths and Bridle Way The public footpath that follows the eastern boundary of Common Field and the proposed mineral extract zone is a well used village facility and provides safe separation from road traffic and a continuous link between the North and South of Betchworth. The road through Betchworth village, (The Street), is narrow and with limited continuous footpaths, continuous pedestrian road crossing is necessary and has potentially dangerous blind corners. The safe footpath is used by school children, connects with Old Reigate Road bus stop and communicates between Church, Post Office, Atkinson House (residential care home), Cemetery, Goulbourn Green (used for village events, fetes etc.), and village events in general. Access to the Post Office, the only one between Dorking and Reigate, and very busy, must not be impaired. The footpath provides un-interrupted views to the West over farm land and to the hills beyond. The proposal to block the view with earth bunds and a belt of trees would turn the footpath into a corridor and not only produces an environmental loss but also poses a potential safety hazard particularly to children and the elderly who walk this route, especially in dark hours. The bridle way crossing Common Field is well used by horse riders and dog walkers. Relocation of the bridle way would need to connect the existing routes in a safe manner, quarry noise would startle horses and present a danger if riders were unsaddled, with potential insurance claims to SCC as a result. iii) National and International Designations The area is within the Green Belt and next to the area, North of the A25 (Reigate Road), defined as an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The site is part of the defined landscape and can be easily seen from the North Downs Way to the North, as can the scars to the landscape of the present Reigate Road Quarries which I understand are having difficulty in finding sufficient quantities of suitable inert material to allow early restoration. The amenity damage to the Surrey Hills area, defined as An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and to North Downs Way views from the walkers route are already apparent with no sign of restoration to the present quarries, further desecration of this internationally acknowledged amenity and the village of Betchworth must not be pursued. iv) Conservation SCC has acknowledged that a protected Conservation Area lies to the South of Common Field proposed quarry. Reference to Mole Valley District Council (MVDP) ENV39, makes it clear that views into and out of Conservation areas must be protected, the planting of belts of trees on all boundaries, hedges of indeterminate height, noise bunds and presumably spoil heaps would be in conflict with this rule, views to the North Downs and important village features would be obliterated. It should be noted that MVDC, (MVDP) ENV39 records that it is a planning requirement that</p>
------------	--

decisions affecting the maintenance or modification of Conservation Areas can only be judged by an Architect. I trust that SCC will comply. v) School The proximity of the proposed site to Acorns Infant School, Betchworth is of serious concern; problems of noise and dust pollution which would occur during site preparation, bunds etc., excavation and restoration, footpath access and safety of children would all be likely to be compromised. SCC has suggested that "it may need to include measures to avoid site preparation and bund construction or removal during working schooldays". I consider that any time constraints would be impossible to enforce and in any case could be a matter of contract between the land owner and the contractor. The unpredictability of programming quarry activities and unsustainable activity timing would make it impossible to relate school holidays with quarry activities. The school has recently gained new facilities paid for by the village and SCC. I understand that a total of £100,000.00 was incurred. The qualities of this highly successful school must not be compromised by inclusion of the proposed quarry in the middle of Betchworth. The destruction of children's education in the classroom and linked outdoor teaching and play is not acceptable. vi) Atkinson House The proximity of the proposed quarry to Atkinson House (residential care home) is unacceptable. Present planning permission for the Reigate Road quarry to the North of and adjacent to Old Reigate Road is yet to be implemented; operation of these sites will greatly diminish the enjoyment of residents who live in Atkinson House. It has been proposed by SCC that as Old Reigate Road is unsuitable for quarry traffic a tunnel, in close proximity to Atkinson House, should link the proposed Common Field quarry to the quarry area, yet to be implemented, immediately to the North of Old Reigate Road. The noise, dust and general disturbance caused by the construction of a tunnel and its subsequent operation on both sides of the road together with other quarry activities would make Atkinson House untenable. vii) Access The use of a tunnel required by SCC could only partly reduce the quarry vehicular access problem, movement of quarry plant and subsequent maintenance would need to traverse Old Reigate Road, this type of plant and equipment is mostly very heavy and would create unacceptable noise, road damage and interruption of legitimate traffic and pedestrians. Old Reigate Road leading to Kiln Lane is an important link between Betchworth and Brockham for residents of both villages, it is a narrow road. Community activities include, infant school at Betchworth, junior school at Brockham, village shops, pharmacy and doctor's surgery at Brockham, Post Office at Betchworth and many cultural and community activities between the two villages. Old Reigate Road carries local buses, ambulances, fire appliances, private cars, bicycles, walkers and horses between the two areas. The A25 is frequently at a standstill during peak hours and of necessity, the Old Reigate Road, is used by locals to meet school time tables and doctors surgery appointments. Any road hold ups arising from any quarry activity, such as tunnel construction, site set up or plant movements, could cause serious problems. It should be noted that (MVDP)5. 131 draws attention to Government policy that community facilities such as schools, social and health must be protected and remain accessible particularly for those members of the public who are unable to visit towns. Inevitable noise, dust and visual problems would occur over many years from both the quarry to the North of Old Reigate Road and in tandem the proposed activities for Common Field to be undertaken in sequence. It will be seen that problems of road use, tunnel construction and use, operation of conveyor machinery and/or piped and pumped sand through the tunnel together with potential crushing plant for fill, plus the actual excavation and restoration of both quarry areas, make the whole concept untenable. Further research by SCC is important to establish which public utilities are under Old Reigate Road together with location, depth and age. Road and ground structure needs to be established together with road structural condition and road loadings imposed by present traffic travelling at up to 30mph on a road surface that is frequently damaged and potholed. It is not sufficient to leave a prospective contractor to undertake feasibility that has led SCC to include Common Field in its preferred list for mineral extraction. Provision of a tunnel will incur further excavation close to Old Reigate Road to provide cuttings to allow the routing of conveyors through the tunnel. A crushing plant is likely to be needed to enable inert waste to be carried on a conveyor and to facilitate compaction of fill on restoration Proximity to the tunnel of noisy plant and therefore to Atkinson House and other residential accommodation with little potential for attenuation of noise is unacceptable. viii) Project Time Span SCC has stated that much of

Reigate Road Quarry has yet to be restored and that further planning permission would not be granted on Common Field simultaneously with any works to the North. (presumably with the exception of the tunnel and its access from the A25). Delays to work and restoration in other quarries are understood to be due to difficulties in obtaining inert waste in sufficient quantities due to a shortage of material. Existing quarry operators have sought planning approval to build waste crushing plant to perhaps alleviate the problem. It is clear that restoration using inert fill essential to common field proposals by SCC to support an open farmed landscape and phasing also identified as essential, would incur considerable uncertainty to the timing of any proposal at Betchworth for either commencement or implementation and completion of mineral extract activities. A period of planning blight will continue for an indeterminate time for the whole of Betchworth. ix) Environmental Impact / Noise Design and location of bunds, stand off distances, and other criteria relating to sound all referred to in previous SCC reports have not been covered in any depth by the current report. Distance to the curtilage of properties is particularly critical when considering noise and dust pollution. SCC previous report for this area included advice from SCC sound engineer that a 70 metre stand off is necessary from the curtilage of properties with a 4 metre high bund in the stand off zone. (For the sake of clarity "curtilage" means any ground which is appertaining to a dwelling under conveyance of that dwelling, thus the area of land to its boundaries that an occupier might expect to use and enjoy). SCC also previously stated that noise impact could also arise within 150 metres of site. SCC location plan does not seem to acknowledge the reduced working area resulting from SCC noise advice. It is my opinion that the proposed bunds will not attenuate the noise to a sufficient degree in this quiet area of Betchworth and does not in any case recognise the contours of the site relative to surrounding properties or upper windows. Construction of bunds will require import of suitable materials and earth capping; construction of bunds will produce unacceptable noise. Access for material to construct bunds can only be by road if site preparation is to precede overall excavation and thus, only by road, already acknowledged as unacceptable by SCC. It is imperative that ambient sound surveys are conducted by SCC in all parts of Betchworth village over a period of time, to indicate winter, summer, holiday and early evening periods. It is assumed that quarry operations would be prohibited at night. Maximum noise criteria for quarry operations must not increase existing sound levels experienced in Betchworth. It should be taken into account that gardens back onto the proposed quarry site and of necessity, windows need to be open in the summer and for general ventilation. Analysis of typical quarry activities in Mole Valley area could perhaps provide guidance regarding anticipated noise generation during all procedures of site preparation excavation and restoration. I have endured the noise in both my house and garden from Pebble Hill landfill site, at my address as above, particularly in early morning with the start up of plant, vehicles assembled and fill compacted. It will be seen that my house is somewhat further away from Pebble Hill landfill than residents in the village would be from the proposed mineral extract in Common Field. I consider that the mistakes of the past should not be repeated and that the quiet village of Betchworth should not be subjected to unacceptable noise over an indeterminate period because it was not sufficiently researched prior to recommendation and commitment. x) Environmental Impact / Dust. Dust pollution to all parts of the village, particularly in dry periods of the year, would be an unacceptable outcome of proposed quarry activities in Common Field. The prevailing wind to the South West (and occasionally from the East) would cause problems, it should also be noted that local land form causes North/South convection currents between day and night up and down the North Downs, particularly in hot weather when dust is at its worst and when prevailing wind is still. Evidence of dust problems can be ascertained by SCC at existing quarries through observation, damping down cannot be relied upon. Dust pollution of Betchworth is likely to cause damage to the atmosphere, health, property and open spaces and must not be allowed to occur. xi) Hydrology SCC acknowledges that Common Field location is within a major aquifer with the River Mole to the South and Betchworth Stream to the East and have indicated that planning proposals should include a hydrological risk assessment. It is imperative that water quality in the aquifer must not be put at risk and essential that SCC undertake a complete study of the implications and risks together with the relevant water authorities who draw water from this region. SCC report mentions that an environmental impact

assessment will be required at planning application. I submit that this should already have been done, in detail, before recommendation for inclusion of this site. The water authority has advised that bore holes at Buckland had to be deepened as contamination had occurred to the water supply and thought to be due to local quarry activities and water table levels. The Common Field is South of Pebble Hill land fill site which sits on the chalk aquifer. The quarry is filled with material that produces methane gas and is likely to be highly toxic. Whilst the land fill is supposed to be clay sealed it is apparent that vapour and therefore potentially water has passed through to a previously unsealed landfill. SCC environmental engineers were made aware of the problem and came to inspect the problem. I am concerned that contaminated fluid will leak to both surface water and into the chalk beneath. It has been reported that the aquifer below Common Field is at 6.5 metres below normal and it is assumed that the water will rise as water extract at Park Pit quarry, Buckland, approx 1.5 Kilometres away, ceases. I understand that sand at Park Pit is moved by pumping using in the order of 1.6 million gallons of water a day, the water is then discharged into the River Mole as waste. Cessation of extract at Park Pit will make a significant difference to the water table levels. An increased water table is a welcome prospect in these days of drought orders and water economy. An increased water table will bring the excavation proposed for Common Field closer to the varying water levels in the aquifer beneath. Flooding of the quarry and potential contamination from the land fill uphill to the North, pumping and water waste for moving sand, together with saturated fill all bring potential hazards of water pollution. SCC limited resources are unlikely to be able to provide skilled continuous monitoring of activities on the proposed Common Field site which would incur serious risks to the area, particularly if back fill material is not controlled. Local experience of Pebble Hill land fill is that whilst inert fill was originally specified the rules were conveniently changed presumably to allow household waste. Other changes involved increased dig and increased height of fill mostly the subject of retrospective planning approvals after the work was committed. Common Field must not be allowed to be recommended or to proceed with the apparent present lack of information and necessary research. Pumping of sand has previously been suggested by officers of SCC as a potential option in connection with movement of quarried sand through the proposed Old Reigate Road tunnel; in view of future likely water restrictions this can no longer be considered as an option. The extract of water by quarry operators has to stop to preserve domestic water supplies. SCC will be aware that Betchworth has a highly varied geological structure beneath residential and community properties with varying clay content mixed with sand. Deep excavation in the proximity carries the risk of varying ground water concentration under the village with resultant increase in problems of settlement and heave to foundations of buildings. Some buildings have previously suffered settlement in dry periods. I trust that SCC will obtain appropriate advice and undertake to indemnify and provide safeguards as necessary. xii) Ecology SCC states that the site may contain Skylarks. The site is well known locally for its support of a Skylark population with nesting on the field every year. SCC officers have confirmed in a telephone discussion that they had heard the Skylarks' bird song whilst in flight over the Common Field. A visit to the site now will confirm Skylarks in good number. I have obtained detailed advice from RSPB who advise as follows: Skylarks are included in the "Red List" in "Birds of Conservation Concern 2002- 2007" which for this species indicates a decline of in excess of 50% in population over the last 25 years. The Skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife Act 1981 which makes it an offence to damage or destroy an active nest or its contents. Only exception is legitimate farming that cannot be delayed. It is apparent from the present population of Skylarks that the present farming is in good harmony with the Skylark. Mineral extraction cannot be said to be farming and cannot claim any flexibility in the operation of the 1981 Act. The Skylark is a ground nesting bird and nests continuously from April to August. It will be seen that even if excavation of minerals is phased over the proposed 4.6 hectare site, no new work could be undertaken between April and August and adjacent works would disturb nesting. Note an offence is considered to have occurred if nests are knowingly damaged. It is already established that Skylarks regularly nest in this field over a period of many years. (note the old house opposite the field and next to the Post Office in Old Reigate Road is called Lark Field) Note local police are required to have a wildlife protection officer immediately on call to prevent injury and disturbance of wildlife. xiii) Archaeology SCC

	<p>acknowledges that Common Field is an “example of an unenclosed medieval field, within an area where previous archaeological finds have been of importance”. also that “prior archaeological assessment and if necessary evaluation would be required as part of any proposal. Archaeological evaluation must not be left as a responsibility of any landowner or future contractor with a commercial interest in the site. It must be noted that (MVDP) 4.2 16 policy ENV49 requires that any site of more than 0.4 hectares shall have a physical survey to establish archaeological content before development is commenced, thus before bunds, planting or excavation of minerals. A desk study will not suffice. 3. Conclusion I have been surprised that the SCC report is based on what appears to be superficial examination of Common Field as a prospective mineral extraction zone. SCC report clearly indicates that SCC intends that responsibility be passed to those who present planning applications and undertake subsequent implementation. SCC have listed factors to be considered in selecting Common Field but generally seem not to have considered in sufficient detail the implications of such factors or to set prescriptive requirements based on in depth local survey of technical and local amenity impact. I do not consider it sufficient for the highly sensitive location of Common Field immediately adjacent to Betchworth village to list matters that should be considered or may be a problem to be assessed by SCC on receipt of planning applications to be assessed on a deemed to satisfy basis. SCC must obtain in depth knowledge by specialist consultants either in house or by appointment who would fully assess all of the factors associated with access, local amenity, hydrology, noise and dust, ecology and not least the location and setting up of Common Field. A recommendation for inclusion of Common Field for mineral extraction on such limited information is not justified. It will be apparent with further consideration that mineral extraction in Common Field is a step too far. My assessment is based on my knowledge of the village and how I and others use the roads, footpaths and community facilities. I have sought comment from others in the village and those such as Mole Valley District Council and our local water authority.. My experience of time spent on the Pebble Hill land fill sub committee of the Parish Council and living close to it has given me an insight into the best laid plans of SCC and the unpredictability of those plans. Future planning consideration would, I assume on approval of the current report, incur a presumption to proceed. Public comment at that stage would carry little weight. I consider it to be imperative that facts are fully investigated before going any further. I trust that SCC will review the proposal for Common Field and with further information remove Common Field from its preferred options and totally delete the area from its mineral zones thus removing the blight from the village. I should be pleased if you would acknowledge receipt of my letter and in due course advise me of the decision that, on reflection, SCC intends to take regarding Common Field, Betchworth.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing to you again today in relation to the Betchworth Common Field site proposed for mineral extraction. Headlines have been made yet again today on the BBC website highlighting that a drought order has been granted in England and Wales for the first time since 1995, banning the non-essential use of water. Under the six- month order, Sutton and East Surrey Water can ban car washing, the filling of swimming pools and watering of parks and sports grounds. The company supplies water to 650,000 people in the South East. Sutton and East Surrey applied for the drought order as the region suffers its driest period for 70 or 80 years. Southern and Mid Kent water companies are awaiting decisions on similar applications. An independent inspector heard objections at a public hearing but his report said that without the non-essential use ban there was a “substantial threat” to water supplies in the Sutton and East Surrey area. Mr Pearson – the Environment Minister said: “The government takes very seriously the well-being of the public and the need to minimise the risk of more serious restrictions if the drought continues.” In deciding which uses to ban, Mr Pearson said he expected the company to maximise water savings and minimise the economic and social impacts on people and small businesses which rely on water for their livelihood. Now having read this, I wonder how the application to extract non essential fine white sand from a 50 acre green belt site in Surrey is going to help this situation, given that the main by-product of mineral extraction is millions of gallons of water. As you will know, water will be pumped out of the site 24 hours per day, lowering the water table only to be dumped in local rivers and sent out to sea. How can we read about river flows and ground water levels being worrying low, but yet the responsible Surrey County</p>

	<p>Council is considering ways of increasing the wastage of millions of gallons per day by considering more quarry sites. Obviously the Betchworth & Brockham water table isn't exactly feeding the water supply of Sutton and East Surrey Water, but the message we are hearing is to conserve water and restrict non essential usage at the beginning of what may or may not become a dry summer, and SCC are entertaining the idea of allowing millions of gallons of water to be wasted through non essential mineral extraction. Where is the logic.? Maybe there should be a local tax on water wastage.! Just a few thoughts to add to my fight against non essential mineral extraction.</p>
Individual	<p>As a former District Councillor for the Rural East Ward in the Mole Valley District Council, covering Betchworth, Buckland and Leigh from 1992 to 1999, Churchwarden at St Michael's Betchworth from 1992 to 1996 and a regular churchgoer in St Michael's since 1983, I wish to express concern at the proposal to quarry sand in the Common Field. As you know, Surrey is one of the most beautiful counties in the United Kingdom. However, this site is adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and to an Area of Great Landscape Value and between two Conservation Areas. Quarrying here would have the effect of further urbanizing this part of the district, which already has too many businesses around the Betchworth roundabout. Quarrying would deplete the water table, increase pollution, destroy the habitat for protected species and cause a visual blight for decades. For all these reasons, I recommend that the application for quarrying in Betchworth is REFUSED.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing again in relation to the proposed quarry site in Betchworth, Surrey. I have learned from a colleague over the weekend, two very important facts. Firstly and most importantly I have discovered that there are many types of sand that can be extracted from the ground. Obvious perhaps to you, but I understand that the type of sand that could be extracted from the Betchworth site is not in fact building grade sand at all, but much finer, much better quality sand used in making glass and used with silica to make chips. So the Betchworth site in other wards provides no benefit to the building industry but merely helps John Prescott's plans to destroy our green belt. SCC must therefore be under pressure to dig up our Greenfield sites, merely for the benefits of government taxation. It is clear therefore that sand extraction from the Betchworth site offers no benefit to the local community or any benefit to the building industry. I also understand that quarrying such massive sites like this, puts huge pressure on the water table. The Reigate Heath site was recently turned down for a further pit, since the water table has been reduced by a further 25 metres due to water extraction. If we are witnessing less rainfall and dryer times and we are banned from using hosepipes, is it right that our land can have millions of gallons of water extracted and dumped in the nearby rivers, damaging the water table around. Should SCC allow our green fields and trees to die just in order to feed the government coffers. Furthermore I don't know whether you have ever visited a landfill site, but perhaps you should visit the now filled Betchworth Quarry. It is a dirty disgusting disgrace. From a distance, the site above the Betchworth Railway station looks very attractive. Close up, the view is very different. There is rubbish everywhere, the 6 inches of top soil is being washed away and the smell is foul. We are not talking here about a brown field urban site, but an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. What is SCC and Mole Valley doing if they cannot protect these areas. It is a disgrace. Put a stop please, to further quarrying in the Mole Valley, unless you can prove that the local environment and the local community will both benefit.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing to you to register my strong objections and opposition to the inclusion of the area known as Betchworth Common Field, within the "Preferred Options for the Surrey Minerals Plan". The true impact of local quarrying on water resources has now become apparent. Old landfill sites are now leaching ammonia and undesirable minerals from the Jubilee Field site (1966) and the Betchworth Quarry Landfill site. Contaminants are now reaching our seriously depleted underground water supplies. Our local bore holes are at a perilously low level and the water table locally has been seriously lowered by the totally irresponsible pumping of water from the Park Pit Quarry, to be dumped as waste into the River Mole. An SSSI site at Reigate Heath is now seriously threatened by the drop in water table and the UK is probably at risk of failing to meet its duty of care under European legislation. All this needs to be corrected and the water table level restored by stopping pumping at Park Pit. A further</p>

	<p>development of quarrying activities with the extravagant use and dumping of water would be irresponsible, adding to the real issue of pollution from subsequent backfill, which local authorities seem to have proved unable to monitor locally. The effect at ground level, destroying a picturesque area with important wildlife species, impact on local housing and heavy transport of material both in and out of the site, all make this a totally unacceptable proposal. Local people will vigorously resist these proposals to the point of Judicial Review, if necessary, in view of the various authorities' actions and possible negligence in these matters. Government plans for additional housing in the South East, without adequate investment or even thought concerning infrastructure services, including the most basic, that of adequate water supply, makes the matter that much more urgent. With the prospect of standpipes in the streets of Surrey this summer, the possibility of significant public protest and demonstration against the irresponsible use of scarce resources, becomes a very real one, even in this relatively prosperous and well behaved part of the country. The Government's apparent lack of concern over environmental matters will be challenged in the local councils, in the streets and in the courts if necessary. Please support and represent the views of local people opposed to the inclusion of the Betchworth Common Field and similar sites within the minerals plans for Surrey.</p>
Individual	<p>I'm sure you will not be surprised to see that I am, like the vast majority of Betchworth residents, still totally opposed to the extension of sand quarrying beyond the natural barrier of Old Reigate Road, Betchworth and right into the heart of our community. Mineral plan/PMZ 55 - The area known as the Common Field I must admit that I found the continued inclusion of this site in the mineral plan incomprehensible. The views I expressed in my letter of the 5th January are still relevant and your continual ignoring of the objections show that your team is not supporting Surrey County Council vision statement. "Surrey is a great county that benefits from the beauty and richness of its natural and built heritage, the diversity of its landscape, and distinctiveness of its communities and strength of its economy. The vision for Surrey is one that will safeguard and enhance these strengths and improve the quality of life for people living and working in Surrey by addressing social, economic and environmental well-being and sustainability". You have I believe received an unprecedented number of letters of objections concerning this PMZ and Betchworth Parish Council had over 350 parishioners at the Council meeting when it discussed this issue, (The biggest number ever to attend a Betchworth Parish Council meeting) All persons present voted against the inclusion of PMZ 55 in this plan bar one, the owner of the land concerned. If democracy still exists in this country then you must take note of this overwhelming objection to this and remove this PMZ from the plan. The residents of Betchworth have lived for 60 years with sand extraction taking place around the village; we can therefore not be accused of not taking our fair share of supplying minerals for the good of the wider community. However enough is enough in this case as this site lies in one of the most sensitive areas of the village as demonstrated by the overwhelming opposition to this extension to the existing quarry. The inclusion of this site will have a devastating effect on the quality of life of all members of our community. CAMEL have clearly presented detailed argument about hydrology and it is clear that any activity that threatens our water supply will be viewed most seriously in the future. Your team has a duty of care not to allow this to happen. The award of a CLEUD within the present site illustrates that once the developer has gained the permission to extract the sand, Surrey County Council is unable to police the activities and thus can not guarantee the return of the land in an unspoiled state for future generations to enjoy, The infilling of any hole is almost impossible to monitor and again you cannot guarantee the use on 100% inert material and thus pollution of the water table will be inevitable. You would then be a party in denying future generations that most basic human right; access to unpolluted drinking water. PMZ 55 must be taken out of the mineral. You need to have courage in standing up for the right of the residences of Betchworth and not an artificially created target set by central government.</p>
Individual	<p>I am writing to object about the proposed plan to extract minerals from the Common Field at Betchworth. Your proposal will be a blight and an eyesore on an area that is situated between two beautiful villages at the bottom of the North Downs, all of which attract a lot of visitors to Surrey. Both villages are conservation areas and Brockham has an open green area owned by the National Trust as well as part of the North Downs being</p>

owned by the National Trust. Brockham and Betchworth are linked by a narrow country road and public footpath which are either side of the proposed area for mineral extraction and used by many people everyday of the year including children (aged 4-11) who commute between the two villages to get to school. Surrey County Council are at his moment in time trying to promote and encourage these children to get out of the car and get to school by more environmentally friendly means. However if you agree to let mineral extraction happen in this area it will be come too dangerous both physically and for their health to allow them to go to school along the footpath or by road unless in a car. My family have lived in this village for over 100 years and we have seen many changes, my Great Grandfather was one of the villagers who helped improve the footpath between Brockham and Betchworth in the early 20th century to make it better for people to walk to and from each village and a lot of other people since then have continued the good work. Now you are proposing to blight this beautiful area with a large, deep, dusty quarry for many years to come which will remove any pleasure from walking this path. That is if it is still open! The area that you are proposing to extract minerals from is very close to the river Mole which will I believe will upset the already fragile water table and increase the risk of water contamination. This is especially so when it comes to refilling the quarry and taking it back to it's natural state, which you will never be able to do as once something natural has been changed it is changed for ever. For the wildlife that use this area as a migration point and the rare birds and animals that live in and around the fields the destruction in their habitat will be another blow to their already fragile survival rate. The houses that surround this land and at the moment enjoy uninterrupted peaceful views over to the opposite village. They will end up viewing large mounds of earth or big holes serviced by very large lorries all day long, this will lead to a loss in value of their property and reduce their quality of life. The other properties in the village will feel the knock on effect from the quarry plans as well as the disruption caused by the lorries entering and leaving the site. How are they to negotiate the narrow country lanes, do you propose to widen the roads so they can access the A25 with ease? This would not be acceptable and would completely change the character of the area as would the quarry. I consider this proposal to extract minerals from the Common Field to be one of the most ill conceived ideas ever put forward for this area, I can understand most changes that are proposed for the villages and that we are always evolving to improve our environment for the pleasure of others but to dig a massive quarry in such a small space so close to people and homes seems totally ridiculous. What are we teaching our children here? On the one hand we are saying protect the environment and on the other it's OK to dig it up because we need it for our building projects etc. so don't worry about the environment will put it back when we are finished. I don't think so it will be ruined for ever. See sense and say NO! to mineral extraction at the Common Field Betchworth.

Comments

- See section 2 and 3 of this report for answers to some of the commonly asked questions
- All comments are noted and will be considered further in the production of the submission draft minerals plan.