

Minutes of the Craig-yr-Hesg Community Liaison Group meeting

held on:

**Tuesday 9th June 2026, 4pm at Floor 3 of the Council
Headquarters, Llys Cadwyn, Taff Street, Pontypridd, CF37 4TH**

PRESENT

Rhian Thomas (Chair)
Simon Gale (Director - Housing and Regeneration Services & Planning,
RCTCBC)
Neil Pilliner (Public Health and Protection Service Manager, RCTCBC)
Louise Davies, (Director of Community Services, RCTCBC)
Gareth Purnell, (Pollution Control Officer, RCTCBC)
Ian Gibson (CyH Community)
Chris Whiles (CyH Community)
Selena Young (CyH Community)
Julian Radcliffe (Area Operations Manager, Heidelberg Materials)
Samantha Stagg (representing Heidelberg Materials)
Luke Owen (Heidelberg Materials)

Katrina Hawkins, Smith Grant and LLP, specialising in air quality.

APOLOGIES

Chris Jones (Head of Major Developments & Investment,
RCTCBC)
County Borough Councillor Doug Williams (Elected Member –
Glyncoch ward)

10. Welcome, Apologies and Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the second meeting of the Craig-yr-Hesg Community Liaison Group and apologies for absence were noted. The Chair explained that due to a change in structure at Heidelberg Materials resulting in a promotion, Astrid Dahl's role has changed and she would be replaced at future meetings by her replacement (who the Chair would need to induct).

Introductions were made later in the meeting.

11. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting

The Chair confirmed that the draft final minutes had been circulated following receipt of amendments from various members of the group, and following no further feedback, it was **agreed** that the minutes are a true reflection of the meeting held on the 24th February 2026 and can be uploaded to the websites of the Local Authority and Heidelberg Materials for transparency.

Action 1: *For Heidelberg Materials to provide confirmation of the sales in 2025 due to possible issues arising from RCTCBC's extrapolation of quarterly data.*

Update: Heidelberg Materials confirmed the volume in the meeting.

Status: Completed

Action 2: *Heidelberg Materials to provide a list of all visits undertaken by public bodies to the site for the year to date (including regulatory monitoring visits) at the next meeting.*

Update: *It was noted that the information would be updated during the meeting as it would be included as part of the Heidelberg Materials presentation.*

Status: Completed through circulation of the presentation to Liaison Group following the meeting.

The public bodies and regulators that have attended CYH quarry (including regulatory monitoring visits) are as follows:

2025:

- Heneb – The Trust for Welsh Archaeology
- National Wildlife Crime Unit
- Fire Service
- South Wales Police
- RCT – Flood Risk Management Drainage
- RCT – Flood Risk Management
- NRW
- HSE
- RCT – Environmental permit inspection

2026 to date:

- RCT – Environmental Permit inspection 25.02.26.
- Inspection regime involves one full inspection and two check inspections in any inspection year (April to March).
- Mobile crushing and screening plant – RCT carried out an environmental permit inspection in 13.05.26 to assess compliance and no issues were raised.
- RCT's representatives (Carmarthenshire County Borough Council) also attend blasts.
- In addition, Craig-yr-Hesg is currently being assessed four times per year by Carmarthenshire CBC on behalf of RCT for planning compliance. Last visit 19.02.26

Action 3: *The Community representatives to feedback to the Community regarding a suitable secondary location for blast monitoring and bring forward the suggestion/s to the Group to confirm whether it is appropriate.*

Update: *It was noted that the address for the secondary location was supplied at the meeting but should not be recorded in the minutes for privacy reasons.*

Status: Completed

Action 4: RCTCBC to include a section on the dedicated RCTCBC [webpage](#) with information around the independent verification activity from Carmarthenshire Council for transparency.

Update: It was noted that the action is ongoing but an update would be provided later in the meeting under the 'Local Authority update'.

Status: Completed following the Local Authority Update

Action 5: Following ratification of the minutes, they would be published to the RCTCBC dedicated [webpage](#) for transparency.

Update: It was agreed that this would be done following ratification of the minutes -

Status: Completed (and ongoing)

Action 6: Heidelberg Materials to liaise with its transport team, noting that HGV drivers are not within the direct control of the company as they are either working for third party hauliers or are franchisee. Heidelberg Materials to bring forward data regarding number of HGVs entering and exiting the site at peak times to evaluate at the next meeting of the Liaison Group (Note: data is likely to only be available on company vehicles rather than external).

Update: Heidelberg Materials confirmed that its transport team has started the process of extracting the information but this is ongoing. It was agreed that, if feasible, the information would be further categorised (between contractors/franchisees).

Status: Ongoing, to be re visited at the next meeting.

Action 7: RCTCBC Highways to consider what, if any, traffic measures (including estimated costs) could be enforced on the existing highway network to alleviate the concerns raised.

Update: The work is in train, working with highways team and is currently being scoped and RCTCBC will report back at the next meeting with the latest update.

Status: Ongoing, to be re visited at the next meeting at the latest

Action 8: Include 'traffic' as a topic for discussion within the Community item of the agenda for the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

Update: To undertake a 'deep dive' on the topic of traffic at the next meeting

Status: Following a discussion toward the end of the meeting to plan future agenda topics, it was confirmed that the next meeting would be a continuation of the Air Quality deep dive, with traffic reserved for a future meeting.

Action 9: The Community to feedback the option to residents to **discharge** the condition regarding the post and rail fencing and way markers on the permissive path, noting that Heidelberg Materials would pause the commencement of work until a decision is made.

Update: No feedback yet as needs clarification

Status: Ongoing, to be re visited at the next meeting

(NOTE: It was agreed that if anybody has an action following the meeting, they have disclosure to talk about that item to complete the action).

Action 10: Bring forward complaints data received to the dedicated Craig-yr-Hesg quarry inbox (RCTCBC action).

Update: In terms of planning enforcement, complaints such as slow worms/complete the dry stone wall are all included since the last meeting, confirm that it's happening and complaints data is being received and included on the data sheet.

Status: Completed

Action 11: 48-hour notice to be provided to the Council regarding information on planned blasts with the caveat that there will be a degree of flexibility in terms of the plans.

Update: Heidelberg Materials is now providing 48 hours' notice of blasts where feasible to RCTCBC and Carmarthenshire, as well as the Community via signage and its free WhatsApp service.

It was discussed that several previous blasts have taken place on a Friday which means that Laura, the officer, who does not work on a Friday, is unable to attend but can arrange for another from Carmarthenshire to attend with sufficient notice.

Status: Complete but agreed to be kept under review.

Action 12: Liaise with the Community to check whether WhatsApp remains the preferred form of communication with Heidelberg Materials regarding planned blasts and feed back to the Group

Update: It is the preferred form of communication but issues around messages being forwarded on preventing people from using it.

Status: Ongoing and to be revisited

Action 13: To prioritise the following areas (in order) for a thematic deep dive at future meetings:

1. Air quality
2. Land Management -Flooding and draining RCTCBC
3. Ecology
4. Blasting

*(Note: Dependent on availability of specialist officers **from both** RCTCBC and Heidelberg Materials)*

Update: As air quality is the most discussed topic among the Community it was agreed to prioritise this topic. As flooding issues likely happen in the winter it was agreed to keep it on the list as second for the September meeting, keep the list as is for now with Emmeline Watkins from Cwm Taf Morgannwg Public Health Team attending in September. Further discussion at the end of the meeting regarding traffic

Status: To keep air quality as a priority following discussion at the end of the meeting

Action 14: Provide an update on mobile crushing activities following its introduction in March/April 2026.

Update: It was noted that the information would be updated during the meeting as it would be included as part of the Heidelberg Materials presentation.

Status: Completed following dissemination of the presentation to the Liaison Group following the meeting.

Action 15: Community representatives to reflect on and bring forward possible activities and initiatives potentially to be carried out within local communities with support from either RCTCBC and/or Heidelberg Materials. *(Note: Examples of activities carried out elsewhere by Heidelberg Materials have been included as part of the minutes).*

Update: Community representatives would share potential ideas at the next meeting.

Status: Ongoing, to be re visited at the next meeting

12. Updates from the Chair

Feedback from last meeting

- The Chair reflected on feedback following the inaugural meeting regarding the order of items such as referring to the Terms of Reference as 'draft' to be able to revisit them in the future as they evolve and mature;
- The standing agenda structure will rotate between Heidelberg Materials, RCTCBC and Community so that everyone has a fair opportunity from a timing point of view (again as a result of feedback following the first meeting);

Changes to Membership

- Membership changes – Already discussed Astrid's replacement. With regards to Elected Members and in addition to Cllr Doug Williams, Cllr William Rees will be contacted following his period of absence.

Ratification of future minutes

- Ratification of future minutes – future minutes will be circulated asap to provide everyone with a period of 2 weeks to comment/make suggested amendments/corrections;
- A final set will be issued no later than 3 weeks following the initial draft;
- In the case of any controversial items the minutes will be re-circulated to ensure there is a consensus, otherwise simple typos will be corrected by the Chair for circulation asap;
- Assumption that members are able to use the minutes from previous meetings to summarise discussion points if they are asked to provide an update;
- Minutes can then be circulated following the meeting and uploaded to the respective websites.

TOR to be updated after Meeting #3

Questions

Format of minutes circulated - can the minutes be circulated in Word rather than PDF to enable changes?

Future minutes to continue to be circulated in PDF for ease of reference and version control but with a final draft copy, to include all the track changes with comments/amendments to be circulated so that the differences are visible to all. The appropriate format for the minutes will be considered again in a future Terms of Reference update exercise.

13. Local Authority Update

Mr S Gale (SG), Director - Housing and Regeneration Services (& Planning), RCTCBC provided an update on the blasting and blasting monitoring. He confirmed that the reported measurements from the last two blasts have since been published to the website with both, in terms of peak particle velocity and the decibels being within limits. But as previously discussed in the meeting, the Carmarthenshire officer couldn't independently verify those as they took place on a Friday and at short notice.

RCTCBC (SG) confirmed that the independent verification is now included in the column and is visible on the website, minus the last two blasts, for the reasons discussed earlier. He also confirmed that the information and records have been backfilled with all the records to September 2024 which responds to the action picked up in the last set of minutes.

In terms of alternative locations for monitoring, SG confirmed that one resident has put themselves forward for monitoring with Carmarthenshire keen for a list of different residential areas they could use, with agreement from all parties, to carry out random and independent checks.

The Community representatives asked if it is possible to have the monitoring undertaken in one location, consistently and get the measurements from one address only so that the data

is more meaningful and independent rather than at random locations. They referred to previous questions from the Community which may resurface, asking why the testing moves between locations, questioning if it is because the results look better.

RCTCBC (SG) advised that the LA monitor at a very similar location to Heidelberg Materials to obtain independent verification that what is being submitted by Carmarthenshire is not being changed in any way. He was able to confirm that the evidence dating back to September 2024 suggests the data from Heidelberg Materials is correct and there is no interference.

RCTCBC (SG) explained the concerns of the Community are that the monitoring is taken at a single point and that some areas experience more adverse impact from the blasts. Through Carmarthenshire, the offer is that if there is another area of concern, they can attend that area. There are two considerations i) identifying the area to be measured, and ii) evaluating if that area should be continuously measured.

The Community representatives stated that this is the third piece of equipment, the first is Heidelberg Materials', the second one is already in place, the third is currently being calibrated, the secondary one should be located at the address that was supplied earlier in the meeting.

ACTION - Agreed to instruct Carmarthenshire, with the secondary device to monitor on a recurring basis at the identified address and for the Community representatives to provide a number of other suitable addresses for Carmarthenshire to use for future monitoring.

RCTCBC (SG) clarified that in terms of the planning condition, all is required for Heidelberg Materials to do is submit, all this sits outside the planning condition and the rest is between the LA and the Community and to provide reassurance to the Community about the results.

The Community representatives agreed that it is about bringing reassurance back to the Community as they previously asked for three measurements and the response was planning and there being no conditions.

RCTCBC (SG) added that there is a request from Carmarthenshire that Laura can be just left to get on with the work and all agreed that the address supplied by the Community representatives will not be publicly published.

RCTCBC (SG) provided a further general enforcement update on the mobile crusher. He confirmed that according to the evidence and in agreement with the LA's own Planning solicitor, the mobile crusher is operating in accordance with the planning permission and condition. Further, there is a separate query around how the mobile crusher works now compared to what was in the environmental statement, however, he stated that would not be enforceable but he gave assurance that Chris Jones, Head of Major Developments & Investment, RCTCBC is working with Heidelberg Materials around providing an answer.

RCTCBC (SG) advised that a number of complaints from other members of the Community are around the environmental statement that was submitted as part of the process with the planning application. The Environmental Statement describes lots of activities that would be undertaken should planning permission be granted and it models the environmental impacts of those. The complaints received are concerned that what is happening on site is different to that set out in the Environmental Statement (ES), which Chris Jones, Head of Major Developments & Investment, RCTCBC, has clarified to these complainants that, unless those issues are included via a planning condition as set out in the decision notice, that even if they are different, the LA is unable to take formal enforcement action.

In response to a query from the Community representatives about the tolerance and differences when those plans are made, and if there is an expectation for scope creep, RCTCBC (SG) responded that with regards to quarries, the first point is that anything the decision maker (in this instance the Inspector and the Minister) felt having read the ES, needed to be nailed down, because the impact of that is so significant we would want that controlled, it will be in the planning permission as a condition. He added that it will only be reviewed periodically as part of what is called the 'ROMP' (Review of Minerals Permissions) sometime in the future. RCTCBC (SG) advised that there is a mechanism to review that permission, to make sure all the conditions are still fit for purpose and that period is 20 or 25 years.

The Community representatives asked whether a review should have been undertaken when the initial planning was put in place for it to end in 2030, should there have been a review at the point when permission was granted for the extension of the time, not the extension of the quarry? RCTCBC (SG) confirmed that when permission was granted for the extension of time, that was, in effect, the review with a new set of conditions.

14. Community Items

Members of the Craig-yr-Hesg Community Liaison Group were presented with a video by one of the Community representatives present in the meeting, Ian Gibson (IG). The video represented a personal account of the development of the quarry and the changing environment and issues that have followed, including the residents' concerns. It also marked the significance of the establishment of the Craig-yr-Hesg Community Liaison Group to open up much needed conversations in a civil manner.

IG set out the key messages identified in the video included:

- Dust - is it safe?
- Damage - is this the quarry?
- Lorries - is this safe?
- Green Space - is this fair?

IG concluded the video by acknowledging that nobody wants to abandon their goals, the quarry wants to continue operating, the local authority wants to deliver its objectives and the Community wants to thrive. He added that if "no-one is willing to concede, then let us use the heat and the pressure to create something of value, a solution, a legacy, maybe we can make a diamond or, at the very least, a ruby in a gravel pit".

The Chair thanked IG for producing the video and for sharing it with the Liaison Group and she acknowledged one of the messages contained within it about the positivity of all three parties coming together to open up conversations.

Community representative (IG) felt that it had been a very good first meeting where everyone had come together and through the video, he wanted to bring forward the Community voice, as he felt that understanding the Community perspective was a good starting point for everyone. He added that if the concerns of the Community are heard and they in turn can understand and appreciate that the gaps are trying to be bridged, their fears will be reduced.

RCTCBC (LD) acknowledged that the video represents the hopes of the Community and the discussions that may come forward from the Community Liaison Group when it was initially established.

Community representative (SY) commented that just because the Regulations say you can do it, should you do it? Should you blast at its current level, should you take this much out of the mountain because you can? She stressed the importance of the Community perspective. She explained that she has had to move away from living near the quarry, having lived there all her life, as it had an impact on her mental health. She stated that she would not have moved if it were not for the quarry.

Community representative (CWh) commented that it is not about just the data, it is about being a good neighbour for the Community and since the concerns have been highlighted and especially during the last two years, RCTCBC has not represented the Community, Heidelberg Materials has not been a good neighbour being just metres away from the Community, he felt they had worked against and not with the Community.

He felt that the Community still get cold responses from RCTCBC when they have questions (especially about the monitor). He stressed that the residents went fifty days without a monitor, time and time again the questions have been asked. In the first meeting of the Community Liaison Group meeting it was agreed that air quality was the main concern, the monitor failed a month later. He asked why it was possible for RCTCBC to be unaware that the monitor failed, it took the Community to advise them that it had.

Community representative (CWh) commented that the KPI is 95% monitoring, at the moment only 84% is being achieved. A recent defective monitor was sent away with no temporary replacement, it took fifty days to get the only monitor back in place.

Reference was made by Heidelberg Materials and RCTCBC representatives during this discussion about the monitors being highly technical kits, with replacement parts not being readily available and that repairs not typically possible to be carried out quickly. It was also noted that Heidelberg Material makes a contribution to the cost of the Air Quality monitor.

Community representative (CWh) stressed that the trust that was built between all parties and the Community at the last meeting he felt has disappeared and now it has to be built again, from scratch.

The Chair thanked the Community representatives for their contributions and again to IG for the work in producing the video. She stressed the importance of hearing all perspectives, capturing all the issues, the importance of comparing and exchanging information in order to make progress. The Chair added that she believed there is much that can be done within this forum.

Questions from Community Representatives

Ahead of the meeting the community submitted some questions to Heidelberg Materials. Heidelberg Materials' response to these were provided by JR within the meeting.

1. Please can you confirm the locations of any blast air overpressure monitoring equipment currently used at the quarry.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed that Monitoring for Air over Pressure (AOP) is carried out at a least one of the locations listed below:

- Cefn Heulog
- Cefn Primary School
- 36 Conway Close
- No. 3 Pen-Y-Bryn
- No. 24 Gardner Close

- The Shop at Garth Avenue
- No. 1 Rogart Terrace

Heidelberg Materials (JR) added that these locations are contained in its blast data document which is shared with RCTCBC and uploaded to their website. The equipment used to undertake the blast vibration levels also measure Air Over Pressure (AOP) and are located at the same location and carried out in a sensitive manner. During the period where they were having some interference while monitoring from some members of the public the quarry team resorted to returning to the location at Rogart Terrace to ensure the safety of all.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed that they are now monitoring back in the Community and will assess what is the closest distance to one of the properties listed from the blast location, to monitor that and provide the worst case scenario in terms of blast vibration. In addition, Heidelberg Materials (JR) reminded the Liaison Group that RCTCBC has sub-contracted its blast monitoring to Carmarthenshire County Borough Council (CCBC). He also advised that the blast database and the scheme are available for everyone to review via RCTCBC's website. He referred to the question which asked for the AOP limit which is 120 decibels for blasts, which, is in accordance with the quarry's operating conditions.

Community representative (CWh) asked how many times the AOP limit has been passed in the last eight years. JR said he would have to check previously held records for this but he was aware that there was one exceedance since January 2024 which was investigated. CWh responded that exceedances in AOP have taken place on 9 occasions in the last 8 years. He added that he was checking for a response from Heidelberg Materials to understand how in-depth its monitoring is.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded that the monitoring is in depth and suggested that any specific questions could be considered as an action which Heidelberg Materials would be more than happy to take away and answer to supply the correct information to the Liaison Group.

At this point in the meeting the Chair asked for clarity and an explanation on some of the acronyms for transparency. For example, MTAN (Minerals Technical Advice Note), a planning guidance that included maximum levels of vibration for quarry blasts in Wales.

2. Please can you confirm what equipment is currently used for blast air overpressure monitoring and who undertakes the monitoring?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded that the precise model may vary, but it's typically either a Vibrock V901 GSM or V900 used, so there is an element of flexibility in terms of the model. He added that these can provide the locations of any dust particular or environmental monitoring equipment currently relied on under the Dust Management and Monitoring Plan (DMMP).

Heidelberg Materials Materials (JR) advised that RCTCBC's appointed representative from CCBC also attends blasts and measures blast vibrations with their own equipment and the data is also captured on RCTCBC's blast database. Any variance between the two sets of data (Heidelberg Materials' and CCBC's) is likely to arise from the vibrographs being located at different distances from the quarry blast. When the monitoring takes place in close proximity the results recorded are the same or demonstrably similar.

3. Please can you provide the locations of any dust particles or any environmental monitoring equipment currently relied upon under the Dust Management and Monitoring Plan (DMMP)

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed that under its DMMP, Heidelberg Materials is required to carry out additional onsite monitoring at specific phases of quarry development. JR set out that, by way of example, it deployed dust monitoring while undertaking the stripping, three months prior to the stripping, during the stripping operation, and for one year after the stripping operation. Heidelberg Materials does not currently have any dust or particulate monitoring equipment that has had to be deployed on site at Craig-yr-Hesg quarry. The local mineral authority, RCTCBC, is also required to carry out regular assessments of the quarry's compliance with the DMMP at Heidelberg Materials' cost.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded to a question by the Community representatives asking whether it was because it was in the conditions to have it during that time. It was confirmed that this was the case, that it was a specific and different type of air quality monitoring to the type of air quality monitoring that RCTCBC has deployed, which is based on the use of a robust and expensive piece of kit. He explained that the onsite monitoring used depositional gauges which catch deposition dust over a period of time and provide an indicative reading, whereas the RCTCBC's air quality monitoring provides a different set of information including live data showing suspended particulate matter levels.

Katrina Hawkins (KH) added that those used onsite, as per the DMMP, are the deposition gauges, which look at visual dust. These were the frisbee-type gauges previously visible on the perimeter of the quarry's site. The samples collected are analysed to provide an average daily reading of the deposition of dust over a month period (reported as mg/m²/day). It is looking at the larger dust particles, which is very different to the RCTCBC Garth Avenue monitor.

KH further clarified that the onsite equipment provides information on directional dust – i.e. whether the dust has come from a particular direction over that month.

In response to a query regarding the standards, KH explained that there are no legal numerical standards in relation to deposition dust but there are rule of thumb standards as set out by the Institute of Air Quality Management. In the DMMP, the industry practice standards are used and the results are compared to those standards. This is very different to the Gareth Avenue monitor which is looking at the finer particles, for which there are legal standards.

Community Representative (IG) wanted to bring the issue back to a Community member's point of view when they wake up and the windowsill is covered in dust again, the first thought is that silica going into my lungs? Is there any way to confirm that the dust that has ended up on the windowsill is coming directly from the quarry knowing that area gets more dust than anyone else.

The Chair at this point wished to move the agenda along due to time constraints.

4. Can you please confirm whether the quarry still operates in accordance with the approved Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), EA and Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) documents?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) explained that at Craig-yr-Hesg quarry, planning permission was granted subject to 57 comprehensive planning conditions. These conditions, together with the approved plans and additional management and monitoring requirements secured through other conditions, form the framework under which the quarry now operates. The 57 comprehensive planning conditions are referred to in their operational capacity on a day to day basis.

JR also advised that:

- EIA / EA – These were submitted in 2015 under the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations for the original western extension application;
- SES - this was a Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) issued in 2021 in response to a request from PINS / PEDW in preparation for the appeal.

RCTCBC (SG) added that the EIA, EA and SES documents are there to inform whether you grant planning permission. Once planning permission is granted, the key document is the Decision Notice and the conditions it references. This means that the EIA, ES and SES are not, in themselves, approved operational documents and they have no legal basis for enforcement.

Community representative (IG) asked if this meant it was too late to have the argument and that the documents become irrelevant once the Inspector has approved and stamped them?

5. Please can you confirm whether there are any public footpaths, bridleways, open access land or other public access routes within or around the quarry landholding which have not been formally stopped up, diverted or legally closed?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) explained that his understanding was there were not any public footpaths in the area that their extension went into, and that is why the permissive path was created, as there were not previously any formal footpaths. As per the quarry proposals and the planning permissions received from RCTCBC, a permissive path has been created which has included setting out path markers and installing kissing gates at either end of the path, connecting the Community to the Darren Du Road.

6. A member of public was recently informed by RCTCBC that some complaints submitted regarding quarry operations were not being received or responded to due to what was described as a system “glitch” involving Google emails going into Trash. Please can you confirm whether this is correct and whether any complaints may have been affected.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed the resident's six emails received between the period 7-16 April 2026 were missed on initial receipt, and as soon as they were made aware of it, they responded to the complainants. JR added that he was not aware of any further issues with complaints going into junk email and is satisfied this issue was dealt with appropriately at the time.

7. Please can you confirm how many HGV drivers or contractors associated with the quarry have faced disciplinary action, warnings, investigations or retraining this year relating to driving complaints, pavement driving, highway safety incidents or dangerous driving allegations.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded that this has been detailed and would be shared separately. The information to be shared would include the complaints received and the action that was subsequently taken in light of those complaints and in fact there were some actions taken against drivers that did not emanate from complaints.

ACTION – Agreed to share the information on the HGV drivers' complaints received separately.

8. Please can you confirm whether EPC-UK currently undertake blasting or related services for any other Heidelberg Materials quarries or sites in the UK?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed that EPC provide blasting services to Heidelberg Materials in South Wales, but the firm also supports other Heidelberg Materials' major competitors in South Wales as well. EPC also provides blasting services to some other Heidelberg Materials quarries in other parts of the UK. JR was only able to speak for the UK because he was unsure of what they do in Europe or beyond.

9. Please can you confirm whether there are currently any areas within the quarry site or surrounding quarry land which are considered unsafe, dangerous, hazardous or subject to operational safety restrictions.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) confirmed that quarries are identified by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) as potentially hazardous places, with the risks ranging from moving vehicles and machinery, falls, blasting and explosives, to occupational health hazards to the dangers posed by vertical cliffs and public trespassing.

At Craig-yr-Hesg risks include moving vehicles and possible falls from height. This was one of the principal reasons the fence line was erected and it since been upgraded to palisade fencing. (Historically, Heidelberg Materials used to have plain farm fencing, but due to a previous suicide and to prevent such incidents in the future, it erected palisade fencing, to protect the Community from the dangers that exist within the quarry. JR added that, unfortunately, they have had to also support the police to search the quarry when following up on reports of missing people.

10. Has the quarry ever investigated whether any local residents or workers have developed silica-related illnesses, respiratory disease or conditions such as silicosis linked to quarry dust exposure? And has any worker been ill due to silica or related illnesses on Craig-yr-Hesg Quarry?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) commented that Heidelberg Materials unfortunately, is aware that a limited number of people and former colleagues have developed respiratory health conditions including those associated with exposure to Respirable Crystalline Silica (RCS). These cases relate to occupational exposure that occurred several decades ago. Since then scientific understanding of the health risks associated with quarrying and mineral processing has evolved, and so too have the measures designed to protect workers. Over recent decades, the minerals sector has implemented increasingly robust occupational health and safety controls to manage exposure to dust and RCS. In line with this, Heidelberg Materials has made extensive improvements to the controls and protective measures that exist on site and comply with all current health and safety regulations and legal requirements relating to the health, safety and wellbeing of employees. Community representative (SY) expressed grave concern that the danger within the quarry has been recognised and as a result workers are being protected but not residents and queried the distinction between quarry workers and residents.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) advised that the distinction is that high levels of protection is needed within the enclosure of the processing plant. That is where the high silica exposure limits are or exposure points are. Outside the building, the risk of exposure is minimal and for example, JR confirmed he, himself is happy to walk around Craig-yr-Hesg Quarry without concern. He added that historically, the people who have suffered from issues relating to RCS are ones that were working within the processing buildings. He reiterated that the risks of RCS are typically associated with working in very close proximity to high concentrations over a prolonged period.

Community representative (CWh) commented on the new guidelines that have come from HSE recently about dry stone cutting on kitchen quartz. Silica has become quite a hot topic and HSE have started reviewing everything. So does Heidelberg Materials think it is a perfect time to review its understanding in view of the guidelines.

The Chair also asked a very similar question, which is, when there are changes to regulations such as the HSE issue, and new regulations, for example, how as an organisation do you ensure you're kept up to speed? How quickly do you embed those and implement those in Heidelberg Materials 's operation practices?

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded that they have a safety team who have regular meetings with HSE through forums about the changes to guidance and regulations which are then cascaded down through the organisation, with information disseminated by the safety team. Heidelberg Materials trains its employees on that and ensure they are up to date. JR added that last year Heidelberg Materials had a visit from the HSE focusing specifically on RCS and they reviewed Heidelberg Materials' controls against the legislation with a view to ensuring that they were fully adhering to the legislation – which was found to be the case. JR also referred to RCS being a hot topic with HSE and the Government for a number of years and that it has been raised at European level and has been known within the industry for a long time.

The Chair thanked Heidelberg Materials for responding to the questions, the responses of which would be captured in the meeting minutes. The Chair added that her intention was to leave enough time and attention to the 'deep dive' item on the agenda and leave 5 minutes at the end of the meeting to capture any open actions and look ahead to the next meeting.

15. Operator Update

Due to time constraints the Heidelberg Materials slides were not presented at this juncture in the meeting but they would be circulated to members of the Craig-yr-Hesg Community Liaison Group for their consideration following the meeting under the following headings:

- Craig-yr-Hesg Quarry - Actions from previous meeting
 - Information on aggregate extraction and output
 - Public Body Engagement & Regulator Visits
 - HGV Arrivals and Departures
 - Other Actions
- Operations Update
 - Current Operations
 - Blasting at Craig-yr-Hesg quarry 17 January 2025 – 22 May 2026
 - Negative Feedback Received June 2024 – May 2026
 - Residents' Feedback Received June 2024 – To date
 - Blast complaints segmented by issues raised June 2024 –May 2026
 - Blast complaints received at Craig-yr-Hesg Quarry 17 January 2025 – 22 May 2026
 - Environmental update
- Thematic Deep-Dive
 - Katrina Hawkins - Smith Grant LLP

16. Thematic Deep-Dive

The Chair introduced Katrina Hawkins (KH) and thanked her for attending the meeting this evening. The Chair also wished to emphasise the need to concentrate on current questions [which had been received shortly in advance of the meeting] rather than questions on historical events from here on in.

Katrina Hawkins (KH) provided some background to her experience and involvement with Craig-yr-Hesg quarry as part of Smith Grant, specialising in air quality and having completed a chemistry degree. KH commented that she has been involved with a lot of work relating to quarries and waste management sites predominantly rather than residential sites and has specialised in industry emissions and planning applications.

KH provided a summary of her work with and for Heidelberg Materials to date, stating that her company Smith Grant became involved with Craig-yr-Hesg in 2008 during the ROMP review, looking at older planning permissions and looking at whether conditions were adequate or needed reviewing. KH explained that one of the issues that came up in 2008 was PM10s and it became one of the key points of discussion including in relation to the primary crusher.

KH explained it was her colleague Tony Smith who undertook a lot of work with what was then Hanson UK to review the new ROMP conditions, with much work on PM10 monitoring.

Following the 2008 period, KH explained that she became involved with the western extension and consolidation planning application, Section 73 application for the shorter time scale and was at the inquiry in relation to the appeal. KH gave evidence on the policy and dust management at the inquiry and has been involved with and working for Hanson/Heidelberg Materials for a long time.

KH provided an overview of particulate matter, which is of all ranges of size, and includes dust, deposition dust, so the visual and visible dust down to PM10, which is finer particles and PM 2.5 is smaller particles again and the concerns with those is that people can respire them and inhale them. KH added that over the last 10 years or so, there has been a shift in focus from visual dust to PM10 and then PM2.5, where there has been more focus over the last 10 years, (particularly the last few years) on the finer particulate matter.

Community Representative (CWh) asked a specific question on the dust on PM2.5 and PM10 and whether it was tested for silica, whether all dust is analysed and what exactly is in the dust.

At this point, KH commented that silica is a different matter and two different things so needed not to be mixed up, KH referred to the questions in order:

1. The ES states that where PM10 data capture falls below 90%, the risk of exceedances is estimated using the 90th percentile method. Why then does the quarry and DMMP rely on monitoring periods with very low data capture rates, including around 55%, 57% and even 47.6%?

KH responded that at the time of the Environmental Statement and the Supplementary Environmental Statement, Hanson/Heidelberg Materials was carrying out its own on-site monitoring, and that was using a DustScan monitor. It was on a big pole, right on the edge of the boundary near the primary crusher. KH clarified that it was not analysing continuously, as it had to be sent off for analysis every two weeks. It was not a real-time analyser.

KH further explained that reference monitors are monitors that are built and designed to allow direct comparison of the PM10 concentrations against the EU and UK standards. They are reference monitors. There are also the indicative monitors which come in different levels, indicative to how accurate they are. She added that a direct comparison of the results with the EU and UK standards is unable to be made from the indicative monitors. The Dust Scan monitor is an indicative monitor but it was very useful for getting information.

KH advised that RCTCBC also had a monitor at Garth Avenue which is a reference monitor that enables a direct comparison of the results with the standards. It is very expensive and very sophisticated as it is analysing continuously. KH confirmed it provides the amount of suspended particulate matter collected not the content of the dust. The Dust Scan monitor that was reported in the ES and SES was not always getting 80% data capture, but that was always reviewed in combination with the Garth Avenue Analyser, which was getting data capture.

Community Representative (CWh) commented on the unreliability of the previous air monitor and how it was frequently out of action between 2008 and 2020, despite this data being used in the application for the expansion. It is therefore vital that additional monitors are brought into commission to ensure monitor reliability and to achieve accurate data for the community to be able to rely on.

KH responded that some of the monitors, the PM10 monitors, are very temperamental which is the nature of the kit. They are so sophisticated, they are temperamental. When they don't work, they have to be sent to America to be fixed. KH explained that the standard reference monitor is an effective piece of kit, but they age.

All the information gathered went to the inquiry and was considered and discussed by barristers, the witnesses and the inspector. KH clarified that the monitoring data, all the data capture, whether it was 20% data capture or 80%, informed the inquiry.

The Chair suggested that at this point in the meeting that it may be more effective if the questions from the Community can be prioritised.

Community Representative (CWh) responded that the main question they wished to (continue) to discuss was whether the dust has ever been measured for silica now or in the past and has the dust been analysed?

KH advised that it will have a component of crystalline and as part of that you have the very, very fine fractions which form the Respirable Crystalline Silica (RCS). That broadly equates to a size of PM2.5 to PM4. It does not mean that all PM2.5 is RCS. Just a proportion of RCS. There are no approved or agreed methods for measuring RCS in ambient air. The dust will contain a proportion of silica. It just does because it will contain sand. There's no argument that any dust generated and any PM10 generated will contain some silica as it naturally exists. The UK has never seen a need to establish any standard for RCS in ambient air.

Community Representative (CWh) asked if there has ever been dust analysed or is there currently dust being analysed from Craig-yr-Hesg or around Glyncoch for crystalline silica?

KH replied no, there never has been, because the standards do not require the measurements and there is no known concerns with RCS in ambient air and there is no approved method. There are some analysers that such as a Partisol that does collect samples that you can then get sent off for content analysis.

The Chair wished to clarify the point that there is no agreed industry method for measuring RCS in ambient air and as such no records anywhere from across the UK. KH agreed with

the clarification and added that any samples are going to contain a certain level of RCS. due to natural background levels.

Community Representative (IG) commented that ambient data can't be measured but queried how occupational exposure is measured?

KH advised that people wear a personal device that has a specific inlet head that is designed to measure that. It is worn for an hour. KH suggested that some sort of research could be undertaken to adapt that type of monitor but currently there is no accepted way of measuring.

Community Representative (IG) wanted to make the point that for a resident that lives in the worst house in Glyncoch, with the dust on the windowsill every day, perhaps thinking they are going to die of silicosis and there's a tool out there that they could wear that would provide them with reassurance that their levels are not on a par with those from within the quarry, this would provide reassurance.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) provided an explanation to the process when occupational health consultants come, for example, to Craig-yr-Hesg and they fit everybody with the personal monitors which clips onto a lapel and the pump is set up to mimic people breathing. They leave it on for four hours. They go away and they take a sample of that. They weigh that sample and they can say, that's the exposure that particular person had. It is then extrapolated.

Community Representative (IG) commented that the process would make you feel safe.

KH added that there is no evidence that there has been an issue of RCS in ambient air anywhere in the UK. There is a distinction between the risk of occupational exposure (as managed by HSE standards) and the risks associated with the low levels of public exposure outside of the quarry.

Gareth Purnell (GP) (Pollution Control Officer, RCTCBC) explained that there is a distinction between health and safety exposure and air exposure, because in health and safety legislation work, they assume you are a healthy adult in a working environment. Their standards, tend to be set somewhat higher than public health standards for ambient air, which everyone experiences, irrespective of their health. He added that sometimes the methods used in occupational settings won't necessarily have the same sensitivity as in general public conditions, because the levels are higher in an occupational setting. You may have a method where it would work in an occupational setting, but it may not necessarily allow you to get down to the low levels, which you may experience in ambient air, but which is still under the public health interest.

Community Representative (IG) reiterated that keeping the context of a resident waking up and they are worried. He suggested that if a test was carried out which allays the residents' fears it would cure the questions they have, it would alleviate the 'why'.

RCTCBC (GP) responded that what it may say is that it will pick up silica at a certain level, which you normally experience above that in an occupational setting. However, you may still be experiencing silica just below detection threshold for that method, because that method is not sensitively designed for public health experiences.

Community Representative (IG) stressed that carrying out the monitoring would help people feel safe, showing readings from wearing it around the quarry and readings from wearing it in the Community, then surely the different readings would help people feel better.

KH reminded the committee that there are other issues to consider alongside the monitoring such as what else are people exposing themselves to and where else are they going?

Louise Davies, (Director of Community Services, RCTCBC) (LD) advised that from a public health perspective, the standards set by government are informed by evidence which currently specifies PM10 as the particle size to monitor for. PM2.5 will be the new standard to monitor against due to the emerging evidence of potential impact on public health. In terms of ambient air and public health standards, the composition of the particles is not the key issue but the size of the particles people are exposed to.

KH outlined the recent developments and stated that the annual average concentration of PM2.5 in 2025 was 7 micrograms per cubic metre with 7.8 being the annual average of PM 2.5 at Garth Avenue. KH explained that the Welsh objective is 25 per cubic metre. The English current standard is 20. She clarified that England has also brought in a new target of 10 by 2040. There is also an interim target of 12, but now changed it again last year to 10 by 2030. So at 7, that is below, not just the current tighter English standards, but the future English standards. She explained that putting that into context, the PM2.5 concentration is low.

Community Representative (IG) commented that the air monitor was down for 80% of the time and that needs to be addressed otherwise the discussions will go around in circles.

KH commented that in 2025 it was operational for a full 12 months and then there was a period of time around the 8th of May this year when it was down.

Community Representative (IG) commented that he thought it was 2025 when there were issues at the quarry that it stopped working and the crusher had issues when it could not blast.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) explained that the year before, in 2024, the crusher failed which led to three weeks of downtime at the quarry. In 2025 there had been an issue resulting in Heidelberg Materials losing six weeks.

Community Representative (CWh) pointed out that he had an open request, going back 12 months with Heidelberg Materials about measuring dust and having it sent away for analysis. He added that it was due to be discussed with the senior team but his emails went unanswered. CWh asked again, on record, because the Community have had their samples sent to an accredited lab and Heidelberg Materials have their own accredited labs. CWh asked if Heidelberg Materials would be willing to pick up some dust samples from the quarry and the Community, send both their samples away, compare the results, to allay the Community's issue of distrust with Heidelberg Materials.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) responded that if he understood more about the methodology of the test/s proposed, the labs to be used and how the results would be used, Heidelberg Materials would consider this further. However, at present he is not sure what additional information it would provide the Community from a public health perspective.

Community Representative (CWh) stressed that the Community XYZ could be the same as Heidelberg Materials' XYZ. He explained that on three occasions their samples have been sent away to Scotland and the results have come back. He explained that the benefit would be working and being transparent with the Community.

Community representative (SY) felt the issue is that Heidelberg Materials are hiding behind the data and not considering the Community's feelings. It is very business-like from Heidelberg Materials' point of view. She added that the benefit is nothing to do with data but about giving the Community peace of mind and stressed that it has nothing to do with

neighbours but it is about how the Community will feel about that {analysing samples}. That is the benefit, that is a building block to gaining trust.

RCTCBC (NP) suggested that at the next meeting when Public Health are in attendance, they will discuss the public health impacts and maybe the methodology as it is a Public Health related issue.

The Chair agreed to capture that point and that it will be for the next meeting to consider the issue through the public health lens.

Community representative CWh added that it would have been nice to have Heidelberg Materials working with the Community.

Heidelberg Materials (JR) wanted to make the point that if a sample is taken Heidelberg Materials can say it's a certain range and Heidelberg Materials can give the Community that proportion, but he was unclear how it would help the Community in any way. He added that considerations such as how long it takes to deposit and other issues may not give the Community any steer it was seeking.

Community Representative (CWh) disagreed and commented that if Heidelberg Materials' results are the same as the Community's results, it would prove to be a benefit for both because it shows that Heidelberg Materials are not hiding behind a smoke screen. Community Representative (IG) agreed and felt it would show that it matters to the Community and show that Heidelberg Materials understand that it matters, they are interested in answering that point. He added that it can feel like the first step and the Community really want to know what is going on, and because it matters to them, Heidelberg Materials should agree to do it for them.

At this point in the meeting, the Chair reminded everyone that there was only 10 minutes of the meeting remaining and suggested pushing RCTCBC NP's presentation as well as Heidelberg Materials' update to the next meeting to concentrate on the thematic deep dive and optimise having Katrina Hawkins present. The Chair asked everyone present if there were any specific issues to still raise with KH?

KH responded to a query (historic) by confirming that the annual reports where all the data was analysed and looked at in detail, including the PM10 considerations and the volume was presented to the barristers on both inquiries.

The Chair suggested re visiting the issue of the state of the monitoring equipment and the defective monitoring equipment at this point in the meeting.

RCTCBC (NP) advised that the monitoring equipment was down from the 7th of April to the 27th of May due to a malfunction, followed by a delay in getting the replacement part. He explained that a part was loaned from the service provider which was put in place. He confirmed that the part has been ordered but unfortunately, the part needs to be fitted in the workshop not on site so it will be down for a few days towards the end of June but it should be up and running after that. In terms of improving resilience, NP advised that consideration is being given to co-locating an indicative monitor at the continuous compliant method and also somewhere in the Community. He explained that the Liaison Group could be used to consider how resilience in the Community can be improved.

RCTCBC (NP) explained that the team are looking to submit an application for a grant with the Welsh Government, which is imminent. So, in terms of more monitoring, he added that it would be a reference method, but it would be a co-located indicative method, so it can be used for widening the evaluation.

In response to a query from the Community representative CWh whether it would be specific to tracking standards, NP confirmed that it would be sufficient to quality assure it against the

data. He added that it would not be a reference method, but it would be an indicative method.

KH stressed that they {monitors} can also be problematic, which is the nature of the monitors.

RCTCBC (NP) commented that there was two years' worth of data, 2024 and 2025 and he clarified that progress reports are always based on the previous year e.g. 2025 progress report was based on 2024 data and the 2026 report, to be published in September, will be based on last year's data.

Community Representative (CWh) queried whether this progress report would include and evidence the 50 days?

RCTCBC (NP) confirmed that it would not feature in this progress report, but the issue would be raised for this year. He explained that a survey was undertaken in 2014 with the detailed assessment looking at composition which was set up in Garth Avenue and Pine View, which identified the composition and silica was part of that. (He confirmed that everyone had seen that report) NP commented that it was considered that the circumstances have not changed in the quarry, the primary crush is still in the same location, and they are still producing the same sort of levels.

Community Representative (CWh) raised a query about using the data from 2014 in view of new fields and the extension of a new piece of land, should we not still be relying on information from 2014.

RCTCBC (LD) advised that it brings it back to the same issue that whatever it tells us about the composition, there is no reference. The obligation to monitor by particulate size does not change, which she acknowledged is a conundrum.

Community Representative (IG) understood the point about not being able to do anything with the results, that there is nothing out there to confirm dangerous levels, but he maintained his concerns that the Community are still worried about their levels of silica.

KH urged careful planning otherwise more questions than answers may be raised.

RCTCBC (LD) suggested that it is a conversation for the next meeting, which will involve a Public Health representative from Cwm Taf Morgannwg who has general population health duty. She clarified that if there was evidence of a particular issue with particular type of disease in the Community they could look at doing additional work, but they would not do that without evidence.

Community Representative (IG) and (CWh) both queried how they can escalate the query about the amount of silicone in the dust, how to get the information and what to do with the information, to be able to take the conversation to that level, and felt that undertaking the analysis to establish the silica content is needed. They set out that if the analysis shows that there is 51% in the quarry and 51% in the Community or even higher from the windowsills, then there is evidence of a major concern that should be raised with Public Health Wales. They stressed that their requests are currently falling on deaf ears.

RCTCBC (LD) confirmed that this can be picked up in more detail in the next meeting but stressed that the issue is that any sample has got to be a representative sample and has to be undertaken in a particular way.

KH agreed and further explained that it is not just understanding whether it is silica, it is whether it is RCS as silica can be found in sand.

RCTCBC (LD) added that from a Public Health perspective, what needs to be asked, is there anything unusual about the health of the Community of Glyncoch that warrants further investigation, which could be a starting point rather than looking at the composition of the dust.

At this point in the meeting the Chair suggested that this issue is carried forward and addressed at the next meeting and asked for any specific Public Health questions to be raised with her ideally 3 weeks before the next meeting (although the Chair's intention was to chase these questions again in a few weeks) so they can be passed to the Cwm Taf Morgannwg Public Health team. The Chair apologised to RCTCBC (NP) for pushing his presentation to the next meeting and to Heidelberg Materials for not having time to present their slides.

NP pointed out that his presentation links in well with the public health theme itemised for the next meeting. He also reminded everyone that there may be an update to report from Welsh Government regarding the grant funding process.

The Chair reminded everyone of the future detailed topics on land management, traffic, amongst others which are yet to be covered but the Chair suggested that the topic of air quality should remain the key focus of the subsequent meeting in September as there are still actions from today that requires greater detail.

ACTION – Agreed to continue to discuss the theme of air pollution at the next meeting in September

The Chair thanked Katrina Hawkins for attending the meeting. The Chair reminded everyone that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 8th September. She asked for any immediate feedback or suggestions from today's meeting.

It was agreed that the right topic had been selected for the meeting as a priority and that there was yet more detail to be discussed. It was also agreed by the Community representatives that progress had been made discussing the difficult issue in a meeting environment, around the table.

RCTCBC (NP) acknowledged the difficulty of the topic as it is governed by statutory restrictions with a requirement to comply with regulatory duties.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked everyone for their contributions and participation in the meeting, for attending and having a robust discussion yet a respectful exchange of opinions. It was anticipated that the minutes from this meeting would be circulated as soon as possible as well as a reminder of the date and agenda for the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 18:03

LIVE ACTION PLAN				
Date of Action	Action	Owner	Deadline	Comments/ Complete
24-02-26	Provide confirmation of the volume of tonnes extracted in 2025 due to conflicting figures.	Heidelberg Materials	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	Provide a list of all visits undertaken by public bodies to the site for the year to date (including regulatory monitoring visits).	Heidelberg Materials	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	Feedback to the community regarding a suitable secondary location for blast monitoring and bring forward the suggestion/s to the Group to confirm whether it is appropriate.	Community	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	Include a section on the dedicated RCT webpage with information around the independent verification from Carmarthenshire for transparency.	RCT	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	Following ratification, the minutes of each meeting are to be published to the RCT dedicated webpage for transparency.	RCT	Ongoing	Ongoing
24-02-26	Provide data regarding the number of lorries entering and exiting the site during peak times to consider next meeting. <i>(Note: the available data will likely be in relation to company owned vehicles rather than external.)</i>	Heidelberg Materials	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Ongoing-to be revisited at the next meeting
24-02-26	RCT Highways to consider what, if any, traffic measures (including estimated costs) could be put enforced on the existing highway network to alleviate the concerns raised.	RCT CBC	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Ongoing - to be revisited at the next meeting
24-02-26	Include 'traffic' as a topic for discussion within the Community item of the agenda for the next meeting of the Liaison Group.	Chair	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Ongoing (Identified as a future topic but continuing with air quality at next meeting)
24-02-26	Feedback the option to residents to discharge the condition regarding the fence/permissive path.	Community	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Ongoing - to be revisited at the next meeting

	<i>(Note: Heidelberg Materials will pause repair works until a decision is made)</i>			
24-02-26	Bring forward complaints data received to the dedicated Craig-Yr-Hesg Quarry inbox.	RCT CBC	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	48-hour notice to be provided to the Council regarding information on planned blasts with the caveat that there will be a degree of flexibility in terms of the plans.	Heidelberg Materials	Ongoing.	Complete
24-02-26	Liaise with the community to check whether Whatsapp remains the preferred form of communication with HM regarding planned blasts and feed back to the Group.	Community	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	To prioritise the following areas (in order) for a thematic deep dive at future meetings: 1.Air quality 2.Land Management - Flooding and draining RCT 3.Ecology 4.Blasting <i>(Note: Dependent on availability of specialist officers from both RCT CBC and HM)</i>	Chair	Meetings 2 - 5	Ongoing/Complete (Continue with air quality at September's meeting)
24-02-26	Provide an update on mobile crushing activities following its introduction in March/April 2026.	Heidelberg Materials	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
24-02-26	Reflect on and bring forward possible activities and initiatives to be carried out within local communities in preparation for phase 2 in 2027. <i>(Note: Examples of activities carried out elsewhere by HM have been included as part of the minutes)</i>	Community	Meeting 2 – Date TBC	Complete
09-06-26	Minutes to be circulated in PDF format with a with a final draft copy, to include all the track changes with comments/amendments to be circulated in Word so that the differences are visible to all.	Chair	Ongoing	

09-06-26	To instruct Carmarthenshire with the secondary device to monitor on a recurring basis at the identified address	RCT CBC	Meeting 3-8 th September	
09-06-26	For the Community representatives to provide a number of other suitable addresses for Carmarthenshire to use for future monitoring.	Community	Meeting 3-8 th September	
09-06-26	To share the information on the HGV drivers complaints received separately.	Heidelberg Materials	Meeting 3-8 th September	
09-06-26	To continue to discuss the theme of air pollution at the next meeting	Chair	Meeting 3-8 th September	

Appendix 1 – Responses from RCTCBC (circulated after the meeting) in response to questions sent by Community Members for the 2nd CyHCLG Meeting held on 09.06.2026

- 1. The ES states that where PM10 data capture falls below 90%, the risk of exceedances is estimated using the 90th percentile method. Why then does the quarry and DMMP rely on monitoring periods with very low data capture rates, including around 55%, 57% and even 47.6%?**

Information contained within the ES was relied upon by the PEDW Inspector (the decision maker). Any information would be contained within the Inspector's Report of the documents associated with the Appeal (presumably on the PEDW website).

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 2. The SES and monitoring reports repeatedly acknowledge “low data capture” and large gaps in monitoring data. How can Heidelberg and RCT say the monitoring is representative of real community exposure when significant periods of monitoring are missing?**

Information contained within the SES was relied upon by the PEDW Inspector (the decision maker). Any information would be contained within the Inspector's Report of the documents associated with the Appeal (presumably on the PEDW website).

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 3. The monitoring records show long periods where there was no quarry monitoring data at all, including gaps lasting weeks and one period of about 56 days. During some of those gaps, the RCT monitor still recorded PM10 exceedances. How were those missing quarry monitoring periods assessed?**

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 4. The SES states the quarry DustScan monitor “does not meet EU equivalence requirements for daily PM10 monitoring” and is “not located at a specific point of relevant exposure.” Why is this still being relied upon so heavily in assessing community exposure and public health impacts?**

The Dust Scan monitor is no longer relied upon for checking PM 10, as the PM10 monitoring is undertaken by the Council as part of their Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) duties.

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 5. Given that PM10 monitoring measures total particulate mass rather than respirable crystalline silica specifically, what evidence does RCT have that the current monitoring regime is capable of properly assessing long-term respirable silica exposure risk to nearby residents and Cefn Primary School?**

The Air Quality Objective for PM10 is a statutory requirement and nationwide objective applied to outdoor PM10 levels where there is a relevant population, rather than relating to particulate composition, such as silica. The Local Authority will continue to engage with its partners, notably the Local Health Board and relevant health organisations that support it, to obtain greater understanding of any public health impacts associated with Craig Yr Hesg Quarry.

- 6. Has any independent long-term community monitoring for respirable crystalline silica (RCS/quartz) ever been undertaken around Glyncoch? If not, why not?**

No, as there are no relevant reference standards to measure respirable crystalline silica in ambient outdoor air. The Air Quality Objective for PM10 is a statutory requirement and nationwide objective applied to outdoor PM10 levels where there is a relevant population likely to be exposed, rather than relating to specific particulate composition such as silica.

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 7. Given the WHO and COMEAP positions that there is no known safe threshold for particulate matter exposure, does RCT accept that “compliance” with PM10 objectives does not automatically mean emissions are safe for public health?**

The WHO guidelines aim to achieve the lowest possible concentrations of PM 10 to mitigate risk but they are not statutory requirements. The national air quality objectives for Wales represent pragmatic thresholds based on assessment of scientific evidence, above which the Welsh Government considers the health risks associated with air pollution to be unacceptable. The Local Authority will continue to engage with its partners, notably the Local Health Board and

relevant health organisations that support it, to obtain greater understanding of any public health impacts associated with Craig Yr Hesg Quarry.

- 8. The Inspector's Report confirms that the processing plant is located approximately 60 metres from residential property, homes are around 170 metres from extraction operations, and Cefn Primary School is around 164 metres from the extraction area. What assessment has ever been carried out specifically for long-term respirable crystalline silica exposure at these distances?**

As detailed above the assessment has focused on the statutory duties relating to the AQO for PM10, rather than specific particulate composition such as silica.

- 9. Given the extremely close proximity between quarry operations and residential areas identified within the Inspector's Report, why was no dedicated community respirable crystalline silica monitoring network required as part of the planning permission or DMMP framework?**

If this was considered necessary by the PEDW Inspector, it would have been the subject of a specific condition. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has no additional information other than a copy of the PEDW Inspector's Report / Decision.

- 10. The SES states that the DustScan monitor is "not located at a specific point of relevant exposure." Why was monitoring not positioned directly at the nearest homes, school boundaries and other sensitive receptors most affected by quarry activity?**

Further comments relating to questions concerning the dust scan monitor were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes of the meeting.

- 11. Does RCT accept that compliance with PM10 objectives alone cannot rule out potential long-term respirable silica exposure risks, particularly in communities located very close to sandstone blasting, crushing and processing operations?**

As detailed in question 7, the national air quality objectives for Wales are prescribed by Government and they represent pragmatic thresholds above which the Welsh Government considers the health risks associated with air pollution to be unacceptable. The Local Authority will continue to engage with its partners, notably the Local Health Board and relevant health organisations that support it, to obtain greater understanding of any public health impacts associated with Craig Yr Hesg Quarry.

- 12. Why is there no continuous real-time community respirable crystalline silica (RCS) monitoring around the nearest homes and Cefn Primary School**

despite the quarry extracting and processing sandstone known to contain quartz?

As detailed above the assessment has focused on the statutory duties relating to the AQO for PM10, rather than specific particulate composition such as silica.

13. Has RCT or Heidelberg ever undertaken particle speciation testing to determine exactly what local residents are breathing during elevated dust events?

The Council commissioned a study of the composition of particulate matter PM10 in January 2014 (as part of the Detailed/Further Assessment of Fine Particulate Matter (PM10) at Glyncoch, Pontypridd) utilising gravimetric samples taken during periods of elevated levels of PM10 recorded at Garth Ave, Glyncoch and simultaneously at Cefn Lane (Pineview), Glyncoch for comparison. The study recommended further monitoring was undertaken to check compliance with the Air Quality Objectives for PM10 using an appropriate method, whereby suitable monitoring arrangements were put in place by the Council. The Council's understanding is that the composition findings likely remain representative of current circumstances.

Further comments relating to this question were provided at the CYH Liaison Group meeting on the 9th June 2026 by Dr Katrina Hawkins (Air Quality Consultant) and the detail is contained within the minutes.

14. Can RCT explain why PM10 monitoring is treated as evidence of "safe" air quality when PM10 monitoring does not distinguish between inert dust and respirable crystalline silica particles?

As detailed in question 7, the national air quality objectives for Wales represent pragmatic thresholds above which the Welsh Government considers the health risks associated with air pollution to be unacceptable.

15. Why was there no requirement for independent monitoring directly controlled by RCT or another independent public body rather than monitoring heavily reliant upon operator-controlled systems?

As outlined in the response to question 4, the Dust Scan monitor is no longer relied upon for checking PM 10, as the PM10 monitoring is undertaken by the Council as part of LAQM duties. The selection process for the air quality monitoring equipment at Garth Avenue was in line with the duty of the Local Authority to consider compliance with the relevant Air Quality Objectives for PM 10 as set out in the Regulations.

16. Does RCT accept that the precautionary principle should apply where there are acknowledged uncertainties, monitoring limitations and unresolved questions relating to long-term respirable silica exposure?

The complex nature of the relationship between local air quality and possible impact on public health is recognised but the Local Authority must work within current regulatory frameworks. The Local Authority will continue to engage with its partners, notably the Local Health Board and relevant health organisations that support it, to obtain greater understanding of any public health impacts associated with Craig Yr Hesg Quarry.

17. Can RCT explain what specific evidence currently exists that conclusively rules out long-term respirable crystalline silica exposure risks to the surrounding community?

Any specific concerns relating to risk to health would need to be directed to the Local Health Board or GP. Public Health concerns are due to be discussed at the next Liaison Group meeting.

18. Can RCT explain how the DMMP monitoring and compliance framework can be considered genuinely independent when parts of the monitoring, reporting and assessment process appear to rely upon companies directly appointed, controlled or financially connected to the quarry operator?

The LPA can only look at information that forms part of a condition that was attached to the consent issued by PEDW. It cannot look at or introduce monitoring that does not form part of the consent.

19. If companies carrying out monitoring, analysis or reporting are contracted by Heidelberg/Hanson, how does RCT ensure there is genuine independence and no conflict of interest within the monitoring and assessment process?

Conditions attached to the consent by the Inspector are normally derived from statutory consultees that were involved at both the Planning and Appeal stages. Where a condition requires the submission of further or on-going information (post-consent), the LPA will consult those organisations to scrutinise any reports. Copies of any consultation responses (in respect of a condition) will be on the Council's website.

20. Can RCT confirm whether any company involved in the DMMP, air monitoring, dust assessment or reporting is a subsidiary company, partner company or commercially linked company connected to Heidelberg/Hanson or their wider group structure?

This is not something that the LPA can look at or comment upon. The response to Question 19 covers the LPA procedures when further information needs to be submitted.

21. Does RCT accept that a monitoring system heavily reliant upon operator-appointed consultants may not provide the same level of public confidence

as a fully independent monitoring framework controlled directly by an independent public body?

The response to Question 19 addresses the LPA procedures when further information needs to be submitted. This is the procedure for all Planning consents.

22. Has RCT ever independently audited the raw monitoring data, calibration records, equipment downtime, excluded data periods and interpretation methods used by consultants acting for Heidelberg/Hanson?

The conditions attached to the Appeal Decision sets out the remit of the Local Planning Authority in this (or any) consent. The LPA may only act in accordance with the requirements of that consent. There is no requirement to independently audit any data, although the LPA employs Carmarthenshire Council's Mineral Planning Team to verify the blast data (but there is no statutory requirement to do so).

23. Does RCT believe the current framework provides sufficient transparency and independence to maintain public confidence in the monitoring and regulatory process surrounding Craig-yr-Hesg Quarry?

The monitoring of Particulate Matter PM10 at Glyncoch is operated in line with the statutory Local Air quality Management (LAQM) framework. In line with guidance, the Local Authority also monitors Particulate Matter PM2.5 to further inform stakeholders and the local community but the statutory assessment of PM2.5 is undertaken by Welsh Government. As with all its local air quality monitoring arrangements the Local Authority undertakes an annual review to allow for changes to be made to reflect local circumstances as they evolve. However, the setting of local air quality objectives/standards and the regulatory framework to implement them is a matter determined by Welsh Government. In addition, the regulatory permitting consent issued by the Local Authority for quarry stone processing at Craig Yr Hesg, is periodically reviewed in line with statutory guidance requirements.

The PEDW Inspector, in imposing the conditions attached to the Appeal Decision, was satisfied that they would be sufficient to address any monitoring or regulatory requirements under the Planning Acts. The LPA are unable to comment on a decision made by a third party.

FOOTNOTE

The mitigation measures proposed within an Environmental Statement (ES or SES) are not directly enforceable in their own right. For these measures to become legally binding, they must be explicitly incorporated into the planning permission through planning conditions or secured via a planning obligation.

The Status of an Environmental Statement

An Environmental Statement is fundamentally an information-gathering and assessment document. Its primary purpose, as detailed in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, is to identify, describe, and assess the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed development. The ES must include an indication of the measures envisaged to avoid, reduce, or remedy significant adverse effects. However, the ES itself does not possess the legal standing of an operative planning document. It informs the decision-making process, but its contents, including proposed mitigation, are not automatically binding on the developer. There is no statutory requirement for post-authorisation monitoring of the commitments made within an ES, which further underscores its non-binding nature.

Securing Mitigation Measures

For mitigation measures identified in an ES to be enforceable, the decision-maker must translate them into formal legal requirements. This is typically achieved through two primary mechanisms:

1. **Planning Conditions:** A planning authority can impose conditions on a grant of planning permission that require the implementation of specific mitigation measures. This is a common and effective method.
2. **Planning Obligations (Section 106 Agreements):** For more complex or off-site mitigation, a planning obligation is often necessary. This legal agreement between the developer and the planning authority can secure measures that may not be suitable for a condition

Consequences of Inadequate or Unsecured Mitigation

If mitigation measures are not properly secured, they hold little weight and cannot be enforced. This creates uncertainty and risk, often leading to the refusal of permission, particularly where protected species or habitats are concerned.

In summary, while an ES or SES is a critical component of the EIA process for identifying necessary mitigation, the measures it contains are merely proposals. Their enforceability is entirely dependent on their formal adoption into the legal framework of the planning permission through precisely worded conditions or a robust planning obligation. Without this crucial step, the mitigation commitments remain aspirational and cannot be legally compelled.