

I also to some extent understand that the landbank of sand and gravel reserves in the county has a shortfall that needs to be addressed. But to try and justify the use of Lea Castle Farm Estate as a suitable site for this is a disgrace, on so many levels.

I just want to emphasise, again that we are NOT a small community concerned about ruining a picturesque chocolate box village (sad though that would be).

Our community is large, spanning Cookley, Caunsall, Wolverley, Franche, and others. Tens of thousands of homes.

We are a hard working community, we socialise together, we share our leisure and recreational facilities, we help each other in difficult times. whichever village we come from, we all pull together.

We have a wonderful community, consisting of thousands and we all share in the pride we feel in belonging to it.

The proposed site is at the HEART of this wonderful community. Smack bang in the middle. It is used and crisscrossed by hundreds of people. It is our access to shared amenities such as pubs, social clubs, village halls, children's playgrounds, tea rooms, cafes, sports fields and schools. It is a safe environment, where we don't need to use our cars, or risk life and limb walking on narrow pavements along dangerous busy roads.

It's a haven of peace and tranquility, a beautiful open space, home to a variety of wildlife. And contrary to the opinion of the Appellant, (who I believe has very little knowledge of the area, other than their strategically taken photographs, and the occasional visits to stick their noise level machines onto gate posts), there is NO comparable alternative to it within walking distance. To get to anywhere like it, in terms of size, beauty and open space requires a car journey. The roads are already very busy.

During this last week, I have heard a lot of debate and listened to the legalities around noise and air pollution, and the potential risks to residents in the area. I have been angered and deeply upset by some of the comments from the appellant who have painted a completely false image of the area I have lived in for 23 years.

They have generalised and tried to persuade us that the measures they propose to put in place to mitigate risk will be adequate. Using terms such as temporary and transient. There is nothing transient about the habits of our school children, elderly & vulnerable residents, or stay at home Parents.

No mention has been made by the Appellant either (that I have heard) that risks are subjective.

The risks to health associated with noise for example. These risks cannot be accurately determined by decibel levels 0.5 (as.6 (ev)-2 (el)2.ne(U)2.6 (s)-2 (i).6 (C)13(ev)O U)2.6 enhUpeo (Thes)1

Perhaps we could put up signs showing the results of noise level tests? Or a report from some expert downplaying the dangers of silica. Would they still come?? You can bet your life they will go elsewhere.

Suffice it to say life has been incredibly hard on both of us with the loss of her long standing professional support network during the pandemic and on going. The crisis in the social care system means we are still struggling alone with no support.

Being able to access this site daily, with her dog, is a long standing routine for her and plays a major role in her well being.