

Sir, - I am here representing Lancaster Road Quarry Boundary Residents.

We are not a distant group or just a name on a document. We are the families who live directly on Lancaster Road — on the final road that **every single** HGV will use to access and exit this site.

You will hear a lot over the coming days about policy, need, traffic modelling, dust and noise. As a group, we have already submitted detailed responses on all of that. Today, I am not here to repeat those points.

What I want to do today is much simpler. I want to ask you to **place yourself in our position** — to understand **our** reality of the true impact and what this will mean for our daily lives.

As residents living so close to the site and on the final highways access route to site, we feel, we have at best been over-looked and at worst, totally ignored, despite the appellant claims in the planning application, that they have consulted with local groups.

Indeed the appellant's most recent evidence **again** appears to dismiss us. They state that 'Lancaster Road is **rarely used by pedestrians**, and that the lack of footways reflects its **remoteness from everyday use**'.

That is simply not the case.

There are **seven properties along this short stretch of Lancaster Road** (if I include Turbo Rebuild), and **four of these, are equestrian properties**, or it would be 5 equestrian if I included The beeches on the other side of the access corridor.

This is not an unused road. It is part of our daily lives.

I walk my dog on this road almost every day. My husband and I cycle out on to this road several times a week, I am not just saying this for this hearing – that is a fact!

We are foster carers — our children walk and cycle along this road to school, to the bus stops, and into the village to meet their friends.

Our neighbours' children at Vine House do exactly the same as do families from round the corner on Head Dyke Lane.

Christine Jones at Pointer House does not drive — she has no option but to use this road to access buses for work, the shops, and local services.

The Brown family from Pointer Stables regularly walk their dog along this route.

Then there are a small number of employees at Turbo Rebuild who both walk and cycle to work due to limited parking.

And it is also a popular cycling route for others as it is the flatter quieter route in and out of Knott End.

And finally there is the high equestrian use — because as I said 4 out of the seven properties have stables : Pointer Farm, set behind Hillfield House, is owned by Xanthe Barker Wild and is an

equestrian showing yard, But also Mr. Henson and his wife reside independently in the Annexe at Pointer Farm, they keep driving horses and drive out frequently on this road.

We at Hillfield House, Pointer Stables, Pointer Cottage all have stables and horses, we ride out regularly and that is just us that **live** on Lancaster Road.

I was surprised myself when I moved here 25 years ago at the amount of equestrians in the immediate and wider area. So it is not just us, there are other riders, carriage drivers, cyclists and pedestrian regularly using this route

This is not an isolated road that is “rarely used.” It is a road that is **lived on, used daily, and shared by a number of vulnerable road users.**

What particularly concerns us is that the proposals appear to rely on an **idealised version** of how Lancaster Road might operate.

It **assumes** that HGV drivers will **slow, stop and wait** where the road is too narrow for vehicles to pass.

It **assumes** that opposing HGVs will **rarely** meet, despite a potential for 120 movements a day on an 230 metre stretch. But, if they do, drivers will simply stop and pull in their wing mirrors.

It **assumes** that pedestrians like us will step aside and wait for traffic to pass — despite the fact there will be nowhere to step aside as the Appellant intends to remove what little verge space is available.

It **assumes** that our horses will calmly tolerate repeated air brakes going off behind and in front of them.

This is not how the road is likely to function in reality. On such a short stretch of road, with a blind bend limiting forward viewing, frequent stopping and waiting is likely to create greater dangers than it resolves. Vehicles following behind may unexpectedly encounter stationary or queuing traffic and be forced to brake suddenly.

If we or others are walking, cycling or riding and are also on the road at that moment, the risks are increased further.

I would simply ask: would you wish to be on that road in those circumstances — or want your children using it?

There is also the question of the **verges, hedges and boundaries**.

We, as current residents, have always maintained the hedges and verges along Lancaster Road, just as the owners before us did. Those boundaries have never been treated as highway land.

The Appellant’s adoption overlays may show a theoretical highway extent, but they do not reflect what actually exists on the ground. The reality is that the road is physically constrained by our long-established boundary hedges and frontages.

The Appellant says the highway should be wider, yet our evidence consistently shows that our property boundaries have always extended directly to Lancaster Road. We can support that with

historic aerial photographs, conveyancing documents and Land Registry records, all of which demonstrate a long-standing and consistent boundary between our private land and the highway.

The Appellant also claims that 7 metres of road width is available at the Vine House bend by removing hedges and including frontage where the boundary wall of Vine House is set back. But Title Deeds and Land Registry documents, again clearly show that the land in front of that wall still belongs to Xanthe Barker of Pointer Farm. It has never been dedicated as highway land.

So while a wider highway may appear on a plan, it is not available or deliverable in practice. **Every single property owner** on Lancaster Road have confirmed in writing, that they will not give permission for the use of their land for widening or the erection of signage.

Yet the proposals appear to assume that:

- Metres of our hedges can be removed
 - Our long established garden and field hedges can simply be cut back or cut down.
 - Signs can be erected in our hedges
 - Narrow verges can be removed
- Areas in front of our driveways utilised
- Wing mirrors are ok to over sail our hedges and intrude into our gardens and land
 - and space can be created

But in reality, there is **not open, spare areas** — notwithstanding ownership and maintenance, in many sections there is no verge or hedge to cut, or even where there is, it can be very sparse.

As such, we believe, what is being proposed it is not to address an **historic** safety issue

Indeed, the Appellant's **own evidence** states that “there have been no recorded accidents involving two large vehicle types on Lancaster Road” — yet they do not appear to consider that this may simply be because there is currently a low level of HGV use on the road

and although the appellant may ‘play down the increase, with descriptions such as a ‘modest increase’ we consider an average of 75 HGV movements or up to 120 on this B road, all year round, is not modest and is a material increase on current HGV usage

Therefore their proposal to improve safety, is really only to facilitate **their development proposals and the additional severe safety risks it brings** .

There is also the reality on the ground of the road condition which raises serious concerns about whether it can safely and sustainably cope with this level of hgv traffic.

Even under, current lighter usage, this length of road had experienced significant deterioration. A FOI request revealed, in the 5 years prior to a full resurface in late 2022, 112 reported complaints were made regarding road quality, which included reported damage to **many** vehicles,.

Us residents directly experienced the consequences of this, with vehicles striking large defects in the carriageway, causing substantial vibration, impact and damage to our properties – which was reported

So when we hear that it can comfortably accommodate this level of HGV traffic... It simply does not match what we know from living there.

When you make your site visit, you will see that once again the road is showing significant signs of failure:

- road edges are weak and prone to collapse; drainage infrastructure repeatedly fails; there have been numerous drain repairs on the road since 2022, the tarmac is again breaking up in several places, and if hedges are cut back as proposed, in some places it will leave ditches immediately adjacent to the narrow carriageway, which will mean there is very limited margin for driver error.

Finally, in terms of living in our homes, many of them sit directly alongside and face this road. They are not set back.

This is where we spend our time — in our homes, our gardens and our fields, particularly in the summer months.

The proposal to reduce or remove boundary hedging is not a minor visual change. It is an intrusion into our homes. A loss of privacy. A loss of comfort. And a loss of the simple enjoyment of being at home.

How are we expected to enjoy the amenity of our homes with warning signage operating throughout the day and night, with constant HGV movements passing our homes and potentially queuing outside them, with air brakes sounding as they stop, start and manoeuvre immediately in front of us, and with the dust, noise and disturbance that comes with this development?

As I have said, four of the seven properties have stables. Our fields are directly next to, or in front of, the heart of the site operations (Phase A) for the full seven years.

We cannot step away from it. We would be living with it every day.

The workers on site will, quite rightly, be protected by PPE – but who is protecting our families — and our animals?

So this is not just about theoretical modelling. This is about:

- our safety
- our families
- our homes
- our animals
- and the way we live our lives every day.

This is not simply a quarry proposal, with a change to a road . It is a fundamental change to how we are able to live.

In summary we believe, The cumulative impacts of the development would result in severe and unacceptable harm to our residential amenity, fundamentally affecting our ability to live **safely** and **enjoy** our homes.

"Can we please ask, that the **true reality** of our lived experience on Lancaster Road is given the **consideration and weight** it deserves.