

Hi,

I have made my objections known at every opportunity during this somewhat protracted process.

I have been passionate, I have been scared and I have tried to be articulate. All of these objections and their contents I know need not be sent again, so I would like to detail perhaps a couple I have noted during the proceedings so far.

Much has been made by the appellant that the lorry movements turning out of the new entrance will not have any serious impact on the traffic situation, a position that I am still astounded at, however little thought has been given to the build-up of traffic waiting behind these lorries when they turn into the site from the direction of the A449.

With the amount of traffic that already uses this road it will turn that road into a nightmare, especially for people like me, a keen cyclist that already finds it difficult to cross the road let alone join the flow of traffic in either direction. We all know that should the quarry go ahead, it would only be a matter of time until deaths occur linked to these lorries. It will of course be too late then, as it would be impossible to have the appellant shut down operations because of the danger to the public. If it is not possible to stop them now at the application stage, arguably the easiest point to stop this madness, it is hardly likely that a few deaths are going to sway the landowner or the company.

We are asked to trust that this company will abide with the conditions placed upon them, however with the proven history of this company, I for one find it extremely difficult.

I watched the appellant's barrister cross examine a rule 6 party witness, who had stated that the quarry near to the M5 at Wildmoor belonged to the same company. The barrister flatly denied that the company had anything to do with the quarry there, however the briefest Google search states that the Sandy Lane quarry is operated by the appellant.

Another expert witness stated that horses would not be disturbed by the ground vibrating and the constant noise of the plant, and that they would 'quickly become used to it'. That may well be, but this does not help the first person that is thrown from the animal with potentially life threatening injuries. I have seen horses 'spooked' by falling leaves in Autumn, let alone riding through an industrial zone.

Witness the fact of the military horses seen bolting through the centre of London some weeks back. Horses that are trained not to respond to sudden noises such as gunfire, cannons, heavy traffic etc.

Yet these highly trained horses threw their experienced riders after being startled by an unfamiliar noise on a building site. Imagine the effect on horses that are only ever ridden through an ostensibly rural location having to contend with the noises associated with heavy digging and depositing of material into metal containers, hoppers and the like.

The appellant and their representation have also rather made light of the economical impact, or maybe a better word would be devastation, that this project would bring to our local businesses.

Admittedly, it is not the centre of a major conurbation such as London or Birmingham, where large businesses would be impacted changing the future for thousands of people, but these businesses are important to us. Heathfield Knoll school alone has over one hundred staff at risk.

As you already know, the simple perception that a quarry may receive planning permission has all but destroyed the riding school and livery yard. It may also go on to destroy local hostelrys, the camping and caravanning site literally next door, the putting green that services visitors to the site and a 400 year old school across the road from the proposed quarry site. A school that has seen more history than any of us and survived much including wars and austerity. This may be the end for them, as has been rightly stated it is unlikely that paying customers would willingly subject their children to a potentially hazardous environment. These are just a few businesses in the immediate area of the proposed site, but the impact will spread much further.

As the proposed quarry is now turning up on internet searches and searches conducted for mortgage companies, the large companies who have invested heavily in the creation of housing estates will begin to feel it's ever threatening presence as their customers go elsewhere, regardless of whether they try to hide the fact. The housing estate to be built on the grounds of the old hospital on the other side of the Wolverhampton road, will be large enough to be classed as a small village, with schools and amenities of it's own, meaning a third village will be blighted.

The barrister's claim that the quarry will be over before building is completed on this housing estate, is apocryphal at best as it has been seen again and again, that the appellant has been granted extension after extension on other of it's quarry operations. It is entirely possible that the building of the estate will have been completed and lived in for a number of years before the quarrying is complete.

As to the proposed amendments to the planning request, if not so serious they would be laughable. It would seem that the bare minimum has been amended so that it can be considered a change.

In the greater scheme of things I imagine that this whole saga would not even warrant a footnote in future history books, but it is no less valid. It is everything to us.

It is not something that we have asked for or wanted, but in defence of this peaceful, beautiful area, all of us have spent a considerable amount of money and effort.

Something that the majority of us really cannot afford, especially when facing the seemingly limitless funds and resources available to the opposition, it is however worth it.

It is my fondest wish that after considering all of the technical aspects, minutiae of law, arguments and counter arguments that you may come to the same conclusion as we do.

I would humbly request that if it is possible under the constraints and guidelines that I know you must follow, that you reject this proposal.

--

Regards,  
Gary Green.