

To: Helen Wass, Team Leader (Principal Planning Officer, Development Management)  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
By email to: [PlanningDC@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningDC@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

From: Dr Sarah Dougan, Interim Consultant in Public Health and Dallas Owen, Healthy Place  
Public Health Practitioner, Cambridgeshire County Council  
By email from: [sarah.dougan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.dougan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)

Date: 13/01/2026

---

**RE: CCC/24/091/VAR**

**Name & Address:**

**Johnsons Aggregates and Recycling Limited (JARL), Saxon Brickworks, Whittlesey,  
Peterborough, PE7 1PJ**

This is an updated submission to this planning variation from Cambridgeshire County Council's Public Health team on behalf of the Director of Public Health. The Director of Public Health has statutory duties to promote and protect the health and wellbeing of the people of Cambridgeshire, including protection from environmental hazards. While both statutory functions are within the same local authority, the statutory duties of the Director of Public Health are distinct from the statutory duties of the Waste Planning Authority.

As the Waste Planning Authority is fully aware, due to concerns raised by the community in relation to activities on Saxon Pit and their potential impact on health, Public Health convened a multi-agency Incident Management Team (IMT) to review the available monitoring data from Saxon Pit in relation to emissions to air, water and land. The public health team is grateful to all partners for their collaboration and support in undertaking this work. As well as Cambridgeshire County Council Public Health, the IMT included the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), Cambridgeshire County Council (waste planning), Environment Agency (EA), Fenland District Council (FDC), and UK Health Security Agency (UKSHA). Regulators have provided data and advice on current operations only. While there is no specific monitoring data available on noise or odour, there have been complaints from residents about noise and odour from Saxon Pit, some of which have been upheld following investigation. The report was published on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2026 and can be found [here](#). Further to the work of other parts of the public health system on air, noise, odour and water, local authority Public Health teams also proactively consider impacts on health and wellbeing in its widest sense including people's mental health and health inequalities.

This response has drawn upon relevant findings from the public health risk assessment (impact of current operations at and around Saxon Pit) in reviewing the documents submitted by Johnsons Aggregates and Recycling Limited (JARL) (future expansion of one of the operations). Findings in the risk assessment and some of the issues raised below may not be attributable to JARL's operations: there are other operators in or around Saxon Pit and also other sources of dust / noise etc. in the vicinity. However, from a public health perspective this application for a variation of planning permission should not be considered in isolation of the surrounding environment and other operations. Importantly, public health considers cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing, not just the impacts of a single operation or process, and that is the basis for much of this response.

Our work on public health is in full alignment with the work of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Health and Wellbeing Board and Fenland's Local Plan (2014) Policy LP2 Facilitating Health and Wellbeing of Fenland Residents (section 3.3):

*“Development proposals should positively contribute to creating a healthy, safe and equitable living environment by (amongst other things):*

- **avoiding adverse impacts** (see in particular LP16);*
- **promoting high levels of residential amenity** (see in particular LP16)*

*For major developments, the Council will require a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to be submitted with a planning application. **Such an HIA will enable the applicant to demonstrate how this policy has been met.** The HIA should be commensurate with the size of the scheme”.*

3.3.7 of the supporting text to Policy LP2 states that: *“The Council’s commitment to improve the health and wellbeing of its residents also extends to mental health which can be helped through creating environments based on equality and fairness...”.*

Policy LP16 states: *“High quality environments will be delivered and protected throughout the district. **Proposals for all new development**, including where appropriate advertisements and extensions and alterations to existing buildings, will only be permitted **if it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets all of the following relevant criteria:***

*(e) does not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring users such as noise, light pollution, loss of privacy and loss of light;*

*(l) identifies, manages and mitigates against any existing or proposed risks from sources of noise, emissions, pollution, contamination, odour and dust, vibration, landfill gas and protects from water body deterioration;*

*(m) the site is suitable for its proposed use with layout and drainage taking account of ground conditions, contamination and gas risks arising from previous uses and any proposals for land remediation, with no significant impacts on future users, groundwater or surface waters”.*

Policy DM6 Mitigating Against Harmful Effects of the Supplementary Planning Document ‘**Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environments in Fenland (2014)**’ states that: *“In order to satisfy the requirement of criterion (l) of Local Plan Policy LP16, proposals should ensure that:*

*a) all new development takes into account **the potential environmental impacts on people, buildings, land, air and water, including ground water, and ecological habitats arising from the development itself and any former use of the site, including, in particular, adverse effects arising from pollution;** and*

*b) **the development does not adversely impact on air pollution levels,** particularly in designated Air Quality Management Areas; and*

*d) **pollution and landfill gas risks are controlled to acceptable levels during the development and operation of the site.** Proposals should set out maintenance measures and long term responsibilities for diffuse and point source pollution and inform the design of sustainable drainage systems, **and applications for major development should be accompanied by a pollution management plan;***

*f) **the proposal would not result in adverse levels of light, noise, smells, vibration or dust, and would not result in or add to land or water pollution,** and which would have an **adverse impact on human health and safety, ecological habitats, the environment, or general amenity.***

***Development proposals will only be permitted where sufficient mitigation measures have been put in place to meet acceptable limits (including any remedial treatment and***

monitoring arrangements) **to ensure there is no adverse impact on human health and safety, ecological habitats, the environment, or general amenity”**.

Previous representations on this planning application from Public Health has been integrated into this response.

**1. The findings of the JARL health impact assessment are based on the assumption that no residents have complained about potential health impacts of this site**

*“This site is already causing local residents' distress due to the noise, dust and smell coming from the pit .... We are breathing in this dust and concerned for our health and that of our children and grandchildren...”*

Whittlesey resident response to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

The submission of a health impact assessment by JARL as part of the application process is welcomed, and in line with Fenland Local Plan Policy LP2 requirements. However, its findings are surprising. It states that there are no concerns of health impacts by residents. The lack of recognition and acknowledgement of residents' concerns for their own health and that of their community by the applicant in their assessment is of concern, as are the conclusions of the HIA that finds that the health impacts are minimal. The applicant's HIA does not have enough evidence within it to draw this conclusion. It does not demonstrate how Fenland District Council's Policy LP2 has been met because the data on which the assessment has been undertaken are not based on real-world evidence.

The applicant's Health Impact Assessment says:

*1.5 Stakeholder consultation is usually an integral part of the HIA process. In this case, because of the scale of the development and population affected, consultation has not been undertaken for the health impacts specifically. However, the proposals were presented to the Whittlesey Liaison Committee in February 2024, which comprises local representatives from Saxongate, the Environment Agency and members from the Cambridgeshire County Council and a Whittlesey Planning Representative. No concerns were raised by any members on health impacts specifically, and the meeting confirmed that no complaints or issues related to operations on site (noise, dust and lorry movements) have been received since the development was constructed in 2021. Some local residents have reported occasional odours, however, during the meeting it was discussed and agreed that it was doubtful that the odour was attributable to IBA material.*

All agencies involved in regulating activities at Saxon Pit, including the Environment Agency, Cambridgeshire County Council (planning enforcement), and Fenland District Council (environmental health) report receiving complaints from residents about the site, relating to dust, noise and odour, over a prolonged period of time. The time and costs for public sector agencies in dealing with complaints and concerns about this site are disproportionate and high. The Environment Agency has had to assign a dedicated liaison officer for this site because of the number of complaints and concerns. Regulators have had to set up meetings with residents because of the levels of concern. Democratically elected members also report receiving lots of complaints from residents and have publicly registered their concerns about the site and its operations. The operators at Saxon Pit are also aware of these complaints. Some residents have self-organised to form a group called SaxonGate with a strapline of *“Public Health First”* which clearly indicates that they have concerns about health impacts. There are stories in the media about residents' concerns about the site and the impact on their health and lives. Within this context it is difficult to conclude that there are no concerns about

health impacts, whether perceived or real, from the operations on site. JARL's health impact assessment has not given consideration to any of these pieces of evidence.

## 2. Cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing need to be considered

*"We are already suffering with excessive dust, noise and smells from the time the operations started in the Saxon Pit. All the above problems cause us great anxiety and reduce our amenity."*

*"The noise, odour and dust from this operation has increased considerably. It is a daily concern. The dust is visible in the garden and on the car within hours of cleaning. It never used to be this bad when Hanson brick production was working on the site. The odour is of ash. What impact does it have on health?"*

Whittlesey resident responses to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

This is a complex site with multiple operators who will all be generating to a greater or lesser extent, noise, odour and dust because of their industrial processes. In the future, this may also include the proposed Science Park depending on the decision from that planning application. Based on available evidence, it is challenging to disentangle the existing source of emissions that are causing concerns for residents and that there may be other sources in the surrounding area too (e.g. agricultural dust, other operators). Additionally, the system for planning (and environmental permitting) of individual operations does not easily facilitate the robust assessment of cumulative impacts on potential harms to human health from all operations on a site (e.g. requiring air quality monitoring of particulate matter on the site boundary), which from a public health perspective, is a substantial limitation of the current system and process.

From a public health perspective, it is the cumulative impact of all processes on residents that matters to their health and wellbeing. It is wholly insufficient to only consider the impact of the expansion of this operation in isolation of existing and potential future operations (including the proposed new Science Park where waste will also be processed). To illustrate the cumulative impacts of current levels of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements from around Saxon Pit, the photo below shows the A605 on the left-hand side – it is covered in dust even with regular road-sweeping by Fenland District Council.





Assessing the cumulative impact is in direct alignment with the **National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) paragraph 5** which states:

***“5. Waste planning authorities should assess the suitability of sites and/ or areas for new or enhanced waste management facilities against each of the following criteria:***

- *the extent to which the site or area will support the other policies set out in this document;*
- *physical and environmental constraints on development, including existing and proposed neighbouring land uses, and having regard to the factors in Appendix B [of the NPPW] to the appropriate level of detail needed to prepare the Local Plan;*
- *the capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and products arising from resource recovery, seeking when practicable and beneficial to use modes other than road transport; and*
- ***the cumulative impact of existing and proposed waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential”.***

**Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)** provides a framework for conserving and enhancing the natural environment. At paragraphs 198 and 199 it considers ground conditions and pollution. Paragraph 198 states: ***“Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:***  
*a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life”.* Paragraph 199 states: ***“Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas”.***

**Chapter 17 of the NPPF (December 2024)** provides a framework for the sustainable use of minerals in local planning policies e.g., at paragraph 223 (b) ***“so far as practicable, take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials”***, and for the determination of planning applications e.g., at paragraph 224 ***“In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should: (b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality; and in the spirit of (c) ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibrations are controlled, mitigated or removed at source, and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties”.***

With respect to considering cumulative impacts, there are two specific aspects<sup>1</sup> that are specifically relevant to the community of Whittlesey:

---

<sup>1</sup> [Cumulative Impacts Background Paper](#)

1. **Concentration of Development** Whether the area is suffering from the effects of a concentration of activity such as existing mineral working and/or waste disposal and whether it would be reasonable to expect communities to accept the additional, predicted traffic, noise or other emanations from the proposed development in combination with the impacts from the existing activities.
2. **Period of Exposure** Whether the local community has experienced environmental disturbance for a long time and whether it would be reasonable to continue to expose the community to future disturbance.

In terms of concentration of development, as previously stated, residents and particularly those living on Peterborough Road, Snoots Road and Priors Road, are already reporting that they are being impacted by activities at Saxon Pit (and beyond) and that this is having an impact on their quality of life. Other residents, including those in King's Delph, will be impacted by the large increase in traffic movements. There needs to be thoughtful consideration by the Waste Planning Authority on whether this site has already reached the "tipping point" of cumulative impacts – i.e. the cumulative impacts are at an unacceptable level for the community - or if not, if the expansion of operations by JARL (particularly the 24 hour working) will mean the tipping point is reached.

On period of exposure, while Saxon Pit has been an industrial site for a very long time, residents have complained that dust, noise and odour have got worse in recent years. The buttressing work being undertaken by East Midlands Waste was meant to take a couple of years but is still ongoing many years later. For those members of the community who are concerned about activities at Saxon Pit (which for some includes specific anxiety about the processing of incinerator bottom ash) and are reporting that their health and quality of life is being impacted, this has been going on for a long time. They are facing the prospect of this not only continuing, but expanding, given that the buttressing work is substantively behind schedule.

Our strong view from a public health perspective is that there needs to be more work with the community of Whittlesey to better understand the cumulative impacts on their health and wellbeing, including their mental health, from activities at Saxon Pit and that operators need to take this more seriously, including those in the wider vicinity. There is a need to understand the scale of impacts from dust, noise and odour. At the moment there is only complaints data which does not provide a systematic way to understanding this.

### **3. Lack of contemporaneous and site-specific evidence in assessments**

With the exception of the air quality report, the monitoring and modelling data in the assessments (noise and geo-environmental) submitted as part of the permit application are from around 2020/21/22. The current operations undertaken by JARL and the actual data from these operations (e.g. noise, dust) have not been factored into the assessments. The noise assessment relies on data from other JARL sites because the JARL operation was not up and running in Saxon Pit at the time of the assessment. If the site from which the data is taken is not actually a pit it is not clear whether the noise assessment is still valid given the acoustics will be completely different. The air quality report appears to be based on a desktop assessment and available data from on-site monitoring and complaints about dust from

residents have not been taken into account. The Waste Planning Authority needs to consider whether measures from 4-5 years ago, data from other waste sites which are geophysically different to Saxon Pit, and models vs. use of current available data are suitable as a baseline for the assessments for the planning variation.

There is inconsistency across the assessments of the sensitive receptors and there is no rationale given for why they differ. Priors Road, where residents have complained about Saxon Pit operations, is not consistently considered as a sensitive receptor. Some children's nurseries do not seem to have been identified and are within 1,000m, which was the criteria defining sensitive receptors within one of the assessments – this may be because the assessment is a few years old and things have changed.

#### 4. Noise

*“The noise is an immense irritant and can be heard with the windows closed. Any activities in the garden for work or pleasure are impossible for both of us. The smell is at times obnoxious and has driven my wife indoors when hanging out the washing. The air never smells fresh even first thing in the morning. The dust is a continuous irritant to us, having to clean windows, cars and causes worry about putting washing on the line.”*

Whittlesey resident response to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

Long-term exposure to noise can cause a variety of health effects including annoyance, sleep disturbance, negative effects on the cardiovascular and metabolic system, as well as cognitive impairment in children. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), noise is the second largest environmental cause of health problems, just after the impact of air pollution.

The WHO guidelines for community noise recommend less than 30 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) in bedrooms during the night for a sleep of good quality and less than 35 dB(A) in classrooms to allow good teaching and learning conditions. The WHO guidelines for night noise recommend less than 40 dB(A) of annual average (L<sub>night</sub>) outside of bedrooms to prevent adverse health effects from night noise. Residents, nurseries and schools will want to be able to open windows when it is hot, which is predicted to become more common with climate change.

Public Health fully supports the response from the Senior Environmental Health Officer on noise – they have concerns about the adequacy of the assessment and proposed practices. More than half of complaints from Whittlesey residents are due to noise and according to partners, complaints from residents have intensified in more recent years. While it is not always possible to identify the source of the noise it is the cumulative impact on residents that matters for health and wellbeing, as recognised in the NPPF and local planning policies outlined above.

In terms of the proposals for the hours of expanded site operation, Public Health is of the strong opinion that 6am is too early. Noise levels should be kept to a minimum to protect residents' ability to have a good night's sleep - crucial for good health. 7am is the accepted cut-off for statutory noise nuisance overnight on weekdays and 8am-1pm on Saturdays so it is unclear why there has not been alignment to this.

The noise analysis has used averages which may be standard practice, but from a public health perspective is a flawed approach to assessing the impact of noise on the ability to sleep

– a single loud noise will wake you up. If and when operating overnight there needs to be consideration and controls about how the operator will avoid loud noises (even where the average is within recommended limits) to protect residents' ability to sleep and how this will be monitored and controlled.

## 5. Emissions to water

The public health risk assessment specifically investigated whether there were any potential harms to human health from emissions to water. There are no identified risks to public health via King's Dyke from current operations at Saxon Pit. There are, however, public health recommendations for increased monitoring (through the discharge permit for the lagoon) and water sample testing at low water levels to check that the risks to public health remain low. While another operator will hold the discharge permit for the lagoon, residents are concerned about water run-off from across the site given the presence of IBA. Public Health has no specific concerns around emissions to water (and which includes rainwater run-off from across the site) as long as there is adequate monitoring moving forward (through the environmental permit to East Midlands Waste Ltd) for the water discharge, and that if issues arise that they are promptly addressed by operators and the Environment Agency, as the regulator of this discharge.

## 6. Emissions to air

*I live in the Snoots Road area. The persistent and unrelenting levels of dust - sometimes black dust - which we have no clues as to the contents - is totally unacceptable This dust covers our gardens and homes and cars daily... during warmer weather it becomes highly unacceptable, unattractive and deeply worrying to have any external doors or windows open as the dust comes into our properties. Every day. With the prevailing winds from the southwest this means all our properties in this area suffer....*

Whittlesey resident response to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

Dust and its potential impacts have understandably been a key concern for residents. While for the most part, complaints from residents are not attributed to a specific operation at Saxon Pit and may even be due to dust from other sources (e.g. nearby fields; other operators outside of the pit), residents have been complaining of dust for a number of years, and some residents are very concerned about dust containing IBA. Complaints data is summarised in the public health risk assessment on Saxon Pit.

The public health risk assessment set out to establish whether there were any risks to human health from emissions to air from current operations at Saxon Pit. The findings were:

- No identified risks in the vicinity of Hallcroft Road
- Further evidence is needed to assess air quality close to Saxon Pit

It is not possible to exclude or quantify risks to public health from air quality in other residential streets near to the Saxon Pit boundary because there is no appropriate air quality monitoring. Monitors need to be able to measure the size of particulate matter at the site boundary to



determine whether there are public health risks. Only the monitor at Hallcroft Road, operated by Fenland District Council, does this currently.

The large increase in operations at Saxon Pit seems likely to generate more dust, including through HGV movements. The ongoing deposition of dust on residents' properties will be at least irritating, if not concerning and detrimental to their health and wellbeing, and amenity (living conditions). Environment Agency monitoring shows that there is already evidence of fugitive dust and dust being deposited at site boundaries with existing levels of operations at the site and from the surrounding area, and the road is also clearly covered in dust. It is not possible to attribute the source of the dust.

The desktop air quality assessment does not seem to have relied on real world data (apart from the FDC air quality monitors that are not near the site) and has not taken into consideration residents' complaints about dust. UKHSA's response to the environmental permit has highlighted other deficiencies in the air quality assessment. This includes:

- Consideration of terrain and topography in the assessment of fugitive dust
- Consideration of the type of materials in dust / particulates, currently stored onsite and the addition of the other materials stored onsite as part of the variation in the permit from the site
- Consideration of the change in height of the stockpiles on the potential for dust generation
- Consideration of the effect on air quality in the surrounding area from the increase in HGV movements associated with the site.

To note that our earlier submissions to this planning variation provided specific details on our concerns about the air quality EIA and the lack of consideration of traffic movements in the air quality assessment. While some clarification was provided by the applicants in the Air Quality addendum, Public Health is still of the strong view that it is important to take a broader, more holistic perspective where cumulative impacts from all sources, including HGV movements which are going to contribute to poorer air quality.

*“Additional lorry loads required by the new application will have a massive further impact of the quality of life, health and safety of the residents along with more pollution and degradation of the roads.”*

Whittlesey resident response to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

## **Conclusion**

In short, Public Health already had concerns about the potential impacts on human health from the collective operations at Saxon Pit, hence had initiated a public health risk assessment and IMT approach. There are additional concerns with the planning variation to increase JARL's operations in Saxon Pit. This is a large-scale site that is in close proximity to residential properties; is already subject to a large volume of complaints generally about the site; and the proposals are to substantially increase operations and shift to 24 hour working.

From our work on the public health risk assessment there are no identified any risks to public health through water or land from current operations on this site. Emissions to air are more complicated – there are no identified risks in the vicinity of Hallcroft Road but further evidence is needed to establish whether there are risks to public health from poor air quality in other residential streets based on available data.

Our biggest concern from a public health perspective is that there are local residents who are reporting that their health and wellbeing is being substantively impacted by current activity levels from Saxon Pit, and some are going to great lengths to try and prevent expansions of operations at Saxon Pit demonstrating the strength of feeling on this. Irrespective of whether there are quantifiable harms to physical health from emissions, it seems clear that the mental wellbeing of some of the people in this community is being impacted and may be exacerbated by the proposed (and any actual) increase in activity at this site. Over a sustained period of time, poor mental health will impact on physical health.

The lack of acknowledgement regarding residents' concerns in the operator's planning submission does not give us confidence that they are committed to ensuring that this development will promote and enhance health and wellbeing in the community. The findings of the operator's health impact assessment are not robust. Some specific aspects of their proposal, for example starting the day at 6am, appear to be completely contrary to protecting the community's health and wellbeing.

In conclusion:

- Contrary to the applicant's view and based on available evidence to date, the community are concerned about the health impacts of this site (and their specific operation) and feel that their quality of life and therefore their health and wellbeing is being impacted. The applicant has therefore, failed to demonstrate that they have met the requirements of local planning policy.
- The community is reporting cumulative health impacts from a concentration of development over a long period of time, and there needs to be explicit consideration of where the "tipping point" was or is before levels are unacceptable to the health and wellbeing of the community. The assessment of this individual operation without consideration of the cumulative impacts from the current and proposed operations within and around Saxon Pit (including the proposed Science Park) fails, in our view, to meet the requirements from the NPPF on cumulative impact.
- The modelled data in some of the assessments submitted for this application does not align with the real-world evidence, including on dust, noise and health impacts and does not always consider cumulative impacts. Environmental Health, who are specialists in the assessment of noise, are particularly concerned about the quality of the noise assessment.
- Noise at night is a specific concern for health and wellbeing, including the applicant shifting the standard daytime / nighttime hours to enable people to get a good night's sleep.

Public Health does not believe that the proposed expansions of operations at Saxon Pit are aligned to the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Objective 11 that states that the County Council will "*protect and enhance the health and wellbeing of communities*" and have concerns that current activities are not either. While fully supportive of the need to process waste, this site (which appears to have poor relationship with its residential neighbours) is too near to people's homes for such a large increase and 24-hour working. Residents have been subject to cumulative impacts from the site for a long time now.

**Our strong recommendation to the Planning Committee is to refuse this planning variation as it does not protect or enhance the health and wellbeing of the community of Whittlesey.**

If the Planning Committee is minded to accept this planning variation, Public Health would like to see the following actions/conditions in relation to health impacts so that there is least some mitigation for residents:

- Deferral of the decision to give sufficient time to undertake a participatory health impact assessment with Whittlesey residents so that the cumulative community health impacts can be systematically understood and captured and fed into the planning conditions. This will take several months.
- That there is clear assurance from JARL that they understand the concerns of the community and the operator takes steps to improve relationships and commits to actions to reduce the impact of their operations on community health and wellbeing and works collectively with other operators in and around Saxon Pit on this.
- Arrangements are strengthened by the operators at Saxon Pit to expedite concerns between residents and operators to reduce the high burden of work and cost on public sector agencies (including opportunity cost) from complaints about their businesses.
- The noise impact assessment is redone to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer at Fenland District Council and appropriate planning conditions are put in as advised by the Environmental Health Officer.
- Sleep is protected for good mental health wellbeing, with daytime hours at the site being aligned to standard practice – i.e. 7am is the accepted cut-off for statutory noise nuisance overnight on weekdays and 8am-1pm on Saturdays. It needs to include lorries arriving on site, given that will impact on residents living in the houses near to the site.
- Poor air quality caused by HGV movements is factored into air quality assessments and that there are specific conditions around fleet management to reduce impacts.
- Adequate monitoring of air quality, water quality, traffic movements and noise to be able to appropriately monitor for public health impacts, and that these results are made publicly available to build trust. The Planning Committee should consider whether there is an option for s106 funding for JARL to pay or at least substantively contribute to this. Public sector agencies have already borne and continue to bear substantial costs with respect to this site.

*My wife and I live in Snoots rd adjacent to Saxon pit. We are objecting to any further increase in operations by Johnson's and any other firm involved in Saxon pit on the grounds that we already have excessive dust daily strong outdoors on many days and noise when the trammel is in operation. We are both retired and very worried about what we are having to breathe in with the dust. we tend to even leave our windows closed on very bad days. We have lost the pleasure of sitting in our garden on fine days. We have lived in the house for over 40 yrs and never had problems like this when the brick works were in operation. we had dust and noise then but never in this quantity and not the obnoxious odours that emanate from the pit now*

Whittlesey resident responses to the Environmental Permit variation for JARL, November 2025.

ENDS