

My name is Pieter Burke and with my wife Helen I have lived at Red Lea Kennels, Bourbles Lane for 26 years.

Although it is strangely missing from any serious consideration in the Appellant's case, Red Lea would be in direct contact on three sides with the operational quarry and be utterly overwhelmed by the consequent activity. My good friend and neighbour Ian Dale living at Woodlands has all but cornered the market in Inquiry references. I know he would not mind me saying that Woodlands is somewhat down a hole by about half a metre and if the quoted 3.8 metre acoustic fence is considered suitable to mitigate noise for Woodlands then Red Lea which stands around one and a half metres above the level and is constructed with the ground floor raised about half a metre above that, would I presumably by my layman calculations require an acoustic fence $3.8 + 2.5 = 6.3$ metres high for the same protection for our kitchen. I would have happily had Dr Storey work it out but I recall him saying a 6.3 metre fence was ridiculous.

Property names are used as easy reference shorthand as a result of which the human aspect is easily overlooked. Red Lea has no opinion on the quarry but the elderly residents of Red Lea are fighting against life changing destruction of their environment.

Both Woodlands and Red Lea would need a standoff minimally at 50 metres, which even the very frank acoustic expert Dr

Storey could not bring himself to deny would be best policy and 100 metres for dust according to the expert witness. The consistent response from the Appellant is “ Think of the mineral. Think of the money. What’s someone else’s suffering compared to the money!”

These near properties are not just points on a map. They are our homes, our remaining lives.

References to dB levels have suggested the quarry would operate at under 50dB. This is below a quiet office level, in fact similar to the noise level in this Inquiry Room. It is completely unbelievable that this level would be a genuine target level let alone an achieved level for a quarry.

I am normally in my element quoting chapter and verse but the Hearing does not need another person doing that. Instead I find myself uncomfortably left to put the human case and respond to the Appellant’s continuous casual use of synonyms for “insignificant” for all manner of objections.

Sitting through the constant shuffling of maps I am reminded of the opening sequence for Dad’s Army. That clearly explained “Dunkirk” but carefully avoided the trail of dead and maimed bodies.

If this planning appeal is approved, it will destroy the health and well-being of all those forced to live in the very close proximity to the quarry. As the site is so incredibly close to residential

properties there can be no possible compromise with this application. I thank all the experts for their helpful input and would have dearly loved to question them. I wish I could have asked the quarry expert Mr Rees how he happily adapted his undoubted quarry expertise to declaring our legitimate concerns as insignificant. But to whom? Certainly not us and the other residents.

The Bourbles Lane Bridleway is a much used path by many dog walkers. Our premises alone accounting for some 40 walks a day.

Our second floor rooms are completely exposed to the quarry workings with no protection at all and no obvious mitigation possible. We have a virtually 360 degree panoramic line of sight of the entire quarry, in particular, because of the incredible proximity, the whole of phase 1, the internal haul road and the complete wash plant and loading area.

I particularly thank Dr Storey, whose candour made it clear that the Applicants wanted the mineral, all of it, and the people whose lives would be marred were just cannon fodder.

We all disagreed with much that we have heard on Tuesday but the only time the public attending the hearing choked on the words was when it was suggested there was little or no health risk associated with living on top of a quarry. I have permanent Atrial Fibrillation and all the medical advice is to absolutely

avoid stress. I can handle a very large aggressive dog without raising my pulse in the slightest, at this moment however my stress levels are through the roof and that is before considering the chronic levels of having a quarry as my very, very, closest neighbour

Mr Rees stated that he was aware of one quarry elsewhere in the country that was as close as 30 metres to a property, although he did not specify to a dwelling. This suggests he did not know of any quarries with dwellings at half that distance. Exactly how close would a home have to be before the location became significant?

It's planned to carry out phase one quarry works to within 19 metres of our kitchen door, less than the distance across this room. Constant reference was made to a time scale of only three weeks-maybe four and the campaign method of working. There was general agreement that in order to mitigate nuisance for Woodlands work had to start at the south end. That south end is actually Red Lea which will just be thrown under the nuisance bus with no mitigation.

The campaign time scale ignores the stripping of the rest of field and the removal of the mineral along with the importation of infill. This is then followed by the re-distribution of the soil and grading of the land. Dr Storey said he had never seen an excavator on top of a spoil heap grading the sides. As a layman

I have never seen it done differently. The noise coming from that is always without any attenuation.

The entire two-way traffic of phase one will pass within 7 metres of our kennels, approximately the distance from this corner to Mr Barrett. Please try to picture a bund at least the height of the light fittings between this corner and Mr Barrett while numerous excavators, lorries, dumper trucks, bulldozers and sundry vehicles constantly drive over him in both directions all day long. That proximity would be intolerable for the proper functioning of this Hearing, regardless of the theoretical noise, and possibly a little unpleasant for Mr Barrett.

Would the resulting decibel level exceed this or that specification? We don't know and don't care, because like our home amenity, the Inquiry would be totally disrupted and probably adjourned to locate to different premises. The appellant however suggests this is inconsequential to us if carried out for years.

We have bitter firsthand knowledge of the actual disruption to the home environment this sort of work will generate as we've been subjected in the past, to the importation of many thousands of tons of mostly inert waste, for burial under the sandy topsoil on adjacent farm land. (Shown cross-hatched on some of the maps.) Although a smaller scale than the proposed quarry, and using less, but similar sized equipment, it was utterly disruptive even with bunds put in place

This was just as the quarry intends to do, but with hugely increased quantities and for years not months.

Objectors have properly raised the health risk of fine silica dust, but larger particles are also a major nuisance.

The slightest wind from any direction sandblasted our home, business and cars while stronger winds forced us to find shelter from the abrasive blast. What size were the particles? We don't know and frankly don't care as avoiding having the skin stripped from our bones was the issue not the particle size.

The sandy grit invaded everything, our home, our food, and obviously we also breathed it in. We all know winds can blow at anytime, 7 days a week, including bank holidays and from any direction and no amount of "good management" can control that.

For the past months winds have averaged much more than double the level needed to pick up particles, with regular sustained gusts six to seven times higher.

The continuous vibrations from the heavy excavators and bulldozers made the house shake and the furniture and windows rattle. The regular stream of lorries, thundered past at speed within a few metres of our property making an insufferable racket and helped cause cracks in the building structures. We do not claim excessive exhaust noise as a major issue, since the rattling and banging from various machine

sources and the basic diesel rumble drowned much of that out. Had the noise and dust clouds not prevented us from spending time outside, the thick, invasive pall of diesel fumes, so contrary to the normal clean air, was sufficient to do so.

Whether in blissful ignorance or total indifference, the water table was disrupted by the works and cracks appeared in some buildings. We are unable to prove beyond any doubt that this was caused by the works but can only point out that the cracks had not appeared in the previous 95 years.

The quarry application too has the blissful notion that extensive interference with the water table will have no effect on the foundations of extremely close nearby homes.

The construction of a massive 3 metres high bund, according to the appellant perhaps a bit bigger, (let alone a 6.3 metre high acoustic fence, within 20 metres of our home will enshroud us, putting us in deep shadow and causing yet more impact on our well-being. We know that massive bunds constructed near our home do not provide any protection against noise, dust and fumes. The construction is a colossal nuisance as it must be built, without any protection, with thousands of tons of material moved and piled right up against the property boundaries. These piles then need shaping by massive excavators working almost in the domestic living space for days on end. Again Dr Storey kindly pointed out that the excavator buckets had a working reach of 10 metres. Even if used at that stretch the

boom would need to be regularly raised and closed up to drop the load in the dumper.

Although the quarry interested parties refer to road journey numbers they make no mention of the noise, vibration and dust produced by the daily inexorable grind of heavy equipment moving in all directions near the afflicted homes.

The image of the continuous onsite merry-go-round, so beloved of Mr Rees, as big excavators fill three twenty-five ton dumper trucks over and over again cannot fail to leave an terrible impression on all the residents. The mental health of nearby residents would be affected by the virtual domestic incarceration required by the quarry activity.

The applicant's assessments suggest there is little wildlife to consider, particularly amphibians. We on the other hand we have watched for years the countless thousands of amphibians crossing Bourbles Lane in the night-time annual migration and countless tens of thousands tiny toads migrating back. We have never tried to count them but from Red Lea to the junction with Tongues Lane it was impossible to step forward without first clearing a space to put a foot in. We also watch the many bats flying on summer evenings. We're present early in the mornings to actually see the abundant wildlife , rather than occasionally turning up mid-morning.

The extraordinarily close, according to Mr Rees possibly unique, positioning of the quarry to people's homes, and all the points mentioned dust, noise, loss of home amenity, loss of sunlight would have massive impacts on our physical and mental health and that of all the people living in the very close proximity of the site.

The proposed site is just too close to homes to be able to mitigate the problems. Mr Rees, was unable to nominate a quarry with housing as close and he is the undoubted quarry expert. He continually pointed out that he considered the quarry to be particularly small, so it is hardly likely to constitute Lancashire's stockpile or justify the damage they wish to do to us.

Mr Barrett felt the LCC were misinformed concerning possible availability of noise mitigation. Woodlands would be in a bad way but it could have some slight noise mitigation possible. Red Lea could not gain from any worthwhile noise mitigation which is why the Appellant has ignored it. It's clear that the planning committee acted properly in rejecting this appalling application. We ask the Inspector to uphold the planning committee refusal and reject this appeal for all these reasons and for the many other reasons which have been put forward by others. Thank you.