

## Email from Chris Howarth 010620 re G&Ts consultation

### Issue 2 (A)

At the council meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December 2019 we were told by the councillors that within the 10 other sites some were deemed inappropriate and some were rejected because the land owner's didn't want to be involved. At the same time we were told that the owner of Tooter Quarry had been written too but at that time they had not received a reply. We were told that, initially, at the meeting that there was no intention of a compulsive purchase order, only later in the meeting for one councillor to give evidence from a previous meeting that the council was indeed trying to pursue a C.P.O. Why did the councillors except the wishes of some landowners not to be involved, whilst pursuing a site that they had not made contact with the owner? The council may now have purchased the land but on the 23/12/19 the councillors voted for this site not knowing the wishes of the land owner anyway. The council had clearly made a decision regardless of knowing the wishes of the owner of Tooter Quarry. Why push this site forward and not consider C.P.O other sites?

### Issue (2c)

With regards to formal assessments of the 10 other sites, I find it difficult to believe, as last week, at this late stage of the process, we as residence have seen a flurry of council agents/consultants within the quarry. If the councillors are carrying out assessments at this late stage, I have no confidence that the other 10 sites would have had any meaningful surveys carried out with regard to Ecology, Bio Diversity, services etc... Again I want to ask the question of why was this site selected and clearly the council had not carried out their diligence. For me, there seems to be no science or logic for selecting this site.

### Issue 4 (A)

With regard to the local bus stop there is one in close proximity to the site, however, on the 23/12/19 the bus service was due to cease altogether. Clearly the council was not considering the travellers welfare and was proposing this site, where other sites had long established, well used bus routes adjacent to the site, particularly the 454 running into Bacup town centre into Rawtenstall town centre. The bus route into Bacup from Sharneyford is a limited service, only running once an hour, currently. So just nipping into town would result in extensive waiting times, for the travellers for the next bus back. At the meeting on the 23rd of December, Councillor Lythcow said, "Travellers don't need transport, they come in vans". Why select a site that has a threatened, unlimited service?

### Issue (4c)

The site does not have foul or surface water drains. We are serviced at the top of Sharneyford by a well which is currently dry with the recent weather. Councillor Lythcow stated that there was water services available within the quarry and this is absolutely not true! Again, why pursue this site with no services when there are alternative sites that do have the said services, in place or within close proximity.

#### Issue (4e)

The sites elevation changes hourly, as evidence from previous photographs have demonstrated. Any survey carried out would have been limited in length and would only have been a tiny snap shot of the true weather conditions at Sharneyford. Regularly, we have very heavy snow fall and very low mist and fogs. Although this is a well gritted road in the winter months, gritting can be overcome by the amount of snowfall we experience in Sharneyford. Why was this site chosen at this elevation when there are lower lying sites within Rossendale that don't experience the harsh weather conditions as we do?

#### Issue (4d)

Despite many images and videos demonstrating how and where it floods within the quarry, the council still claim that it does not flood. Any map that is produced to show how the quarry floods, in my mind, would not truly reflect the flooding which occurs within it. Some images were sent to the councillors since the meeting on the 23/12/19 and prior to this. We have just experienced the driest spring on record and the water in the quarry has abated significantly, again a site visit is only going to produce a snapshot of the quarry! The quarry entrance floods has evidenced and the centre of the quarry floods. Essentially the whole of the quarry floods. Sending out an expert to assess it in the middle of a drought is clearly not going to give you, at this late stage, a clear picture of how the quarry is.

#### Issue (4i)

The County Council may not have any evidence of road safety issues in Sharneyford, however, last week a cow was killed on the road and fortunately no persons were injured. My property, which is opposite the quarry has been crashed into three times over a twelve month period. There has been a road traffic collision metres from the entrance of Tooter Quarry. In addition to this, last February 2019, a vehicle travelling through Sharneyford crashed into several cars parked near to Sharneyford Primary school, then ended up on its roof. I have video footage of speeding vehicles overtaking on the bend, brow of the hill and passing the entrance to Tooter Quarry. I can forward this evidence at your request. Placing travellers at this site would be irresponsible due to the lack of the speed and

dangers of this road. Many children of travelling families are poor attenders in school and may not have had the intervention programme input with regards to road safety which will put them at high risk if they were to inhabit this site.

Issue not discussed-

Within the quarry there is a 100ft unprotected quarry face that is shale based and full of loose rocks, these are at the far end of the quarry and there is another unpredicted edge at the North end of the quarry which is approximately 40ft, which is again full of shale and falling rocks. For children and toddlers, playing and walking, either on top of or under these quarry faces, it would, without doubt, present a fall or an impact hazard with something falling on them. For the council to put in mitigation, such as high fencing as a fall restraint, would without doubt affect the visual aspect of the skyline of the quarry if it was to be truly child proof. Why select a site that has any form of hazard? Wouldn't it be wiser to choose a site with not all of the said safety critical issues? Referring back to the flooding issue, even though the water has abated, there is still a drowning risk to a young child.

Issue (6c)

Sites that I proposed during the consultation, such as John St Whitworth and Valley View Whitworth (where there is a settled travelling community) are sites which were regularly used by travellers have had earth banks and quarry stones placed around them to prevent traveller access, even though a Whitworth Councillor said at the meeting on the 23/12/19 "It's not that we don't want them in Whitworth we had them here 50 years ago and they were very good." If they were that good why did Whitworth Council place barriers around the sites to prevent access?

I assume that there is legal action, or there has been. Put in place to move on the travellers when they have visited Futures Park. If this is the case how could Councillor Barnes comment that, "The travellers will only be coming for a few weeks a year". I would suggest that there would be a permanent fixture at Futures Park. If it weren't for such legal action, which leads me to believe that once the travellers are at this site there will be no will on behalf of the council to put in place enforcement action to move the travellers on, who over stay in what we believe will be an impossible condition to manage.