

APPELLANT NOTE ON CONVEYORS

1. The question of conveyors v mobile haulage was considered in the previous appeal Ref. APP/M1900/W/21/3278097. The proof of evidence of Gregor Mutch in that appeal is at CD1.2A (Section 8) and the rebuttal proof of evidence of Gregor Mutch in that appeal is at CD1.2B.
2. Conveyors can offer an advantage of reducing carbon, noise and dust emissions. These advantages are only delivered on longer conveyor routes. Such benefits are not delivered on this site due to the short flat distance from the extraction areas to the stocking area.
3. The reason there is no advantage on shorter conveyors is that two additional mobile loading shovels would be required to handle material at each end of the conveyor.
4. The first loading shovel would be required to carry and load the conveyor at one end.
5. The second loading shovel would be required at the processing plant site to lift material from the end of the conveyor, which has limited storage under the discharge point, and place in stock.
6. The fuel required to operate two loading shovels equates to three vehicles running an average 1.1km round trips on level ground. (It will take a vehicle less than two minutes to haul from the extraction area to the stocking area. Total cycle time less than eight minutes). Consequently, there would be no saving in power or carbon footprint through the introduction of a conveyor system.
7. In addition, the conveyor would be a fixed structure (typically 1.2m – 1.5m off the ground for most of its length, save for the feed hopper which would stand at 4.5m off the ground and the discharge end which would stand at 13.0m above the ground to develop a 'surge pile') for the duration of the development which would:
 - a. Reduce public access to a large part of the Site due to the fixed conveyor structure bisecting the Site.
 - b. The roads for accessing the working area would still be required for the movement of plant and importation of inert fill but would be moved as the Site is developed from phase to phase.
 - c. Would prevent mineral extraction and restoration along the first leg of the conveyor line until the end of the development.
8. Extraction has to be in seasonal campaigns with excavated minerals being transported over a short distance of on average 550m. Mobile transport will only be used for sand and gravel haulage during those times, whereas part of the conveyor system would remain as a permanent feature. The conveyor would be fixed to the mid pivot point and would be moved in an arc on the second leg to each phase of the development to reduce haulage (see Figure 5).
9. The question of potential noise impact from mobile haulage for the sand and gravel for those using the areas within the site that are not in operational use was raised during the Inquiry. There is no standard against which to assess noise levels in environments such as footpaths in the countryside. It is noted that the Colney Heath Group expressed a preference for mobile haulage over conveyors (acknowledging that this was not to be seen as an acceptance of the proposal as a whole).

Figure 5 shows a conveyor position for extraction of Phase A

