

# **ARROW 7 – Arrow response to Whitemoss Landfill Ltd’s submission on the “Background to Arrow”<sup>1</sup>**

## **Submission on behalf of Arrow**

by Nicola Escott and Claire Robinson, Arrow

Ref WS010003

Arrow ref: 10024954

15<sup>th</sup> September 2014

## **1. Whitemoss Landfill Ltd stated:**

*“It is considered that the Examining Authority may not have been provided with full details of the background of ARROW who have presented a number of different submissions... ARROW was set up initially to oppose the waste development at Round ‘O’ Quarry and opposes all methods of waste disposal which they believe are unsustainable and harmful to human health and the environment. We are not aware whether ARROW is a formalised group which has a constitution in place based on which they canvas and then convey the views of their members.”*

**Arrow considers that the statements made by Whitemoss are ill-judged, inaccurate, entirely inappropriate in this context and defamatory. We note that Rosie Cooper MP has written a detailed letter in which she expresses her deep disappointment of the attempts taken by the applicant to undermine the credibility of ARROW and are grateful that she has made the effort to clarify her belief that ARROW ‘absolutely represent residents and the local community who wish to oppose the landfill site. ARROW would further clarify:**

Arrow has represented the local community for over 18 years on various waste and recycling issues. Arrow is not a membership organisation and is entirely dependent on financial donations from the thousands of local people who have supported its aims and objectives over the years. The fees of expert witnesses instructed by Arrow in the Whitemoss campaign are being funded by the donations from this diverse group of local supporters.

Arrow enjoys the support of thousands of local residents, County and Borough Councillors, local parish councils, local and regional CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England), Friends of the Earth, local doctors, businesses, residents’ associations, pensioners’ groups, and school governors.

Arrow exists as a vehicle to enable the collective action of the community. The core group consists of local residents of diverse backgrounds who have come together based solely on their interest in, and concern about, waste issues.

ARROW Northwest is a voluntary organisation with no paid workers, which is committed to achieving its aims through peaceful and legal means. Arrow is a not for profit company limited by guarantee, registration no. 3792757 (England and Wales). Its registered address is: Beacon House, Willow Walk, Skelmersdale, Lancs WN8 6UR.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Annex B to the letter to PINS dated 24 July 2014: Points of clarification arising as a result of oral submissions at the Open Floor Hearings held on 17 and 18 July 2014”,<sup>1</sup> point no. 7, “Background to Arrow”

Arrow's principal activity as expressed in its financial statement deposited at Companies House is:

"To prevent Round O Quarry, Skelmersdale becoming a waste tip by promoting waste minimization, re-use and recycling both locally and nationally, and by opposing all methods of waste disposal which we believe to be unsustainable and harmful to human health and the environment.

"To promote sustainable use of natural resources, energy conservation and conservation of fossil fuel byproducts, locally and nationally through the advancement of sustainable local economies and to oppose all methods of energy generation and economic activity which Arrow believes to be damaging to human health, the environment and the climate."

**2. Whitemoss Landfill Ltd stated:** "We are unclear whether the representations presented by individuals are their personal opinions or those of ARROW as a whole."

**Arrow replies:** All submissions made to the Whitemoss public examination on behalf of Arrow state this on the submission. The views expressed in Arrow submissions are those of the organisation. These views are not submitted as personal opinions, though clearly in many cases the personal opinions of the supporters are very closely aligned with those of Arrow.

A list of Arrow representations submitted to the public examination is as follows:

- ARROW 1 – Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions and Requests for Information – Alan Watson (Public Interest Consultants)
- ARROW 2 – Objection to the application by Whitemoss Landfill Ltd on the grounds of risks to public health – Claire Robinson and Alan Watson (Public Interest Consultants)
- ARROW 3 – Submission on Health and Community Impacts and the Perception of Risk - Alan Watson (Public Interest Consultants), Claire Robinson, Del Ellis and Nicola Escott
- ARROW 4 – Submission on behalf of Friends of the Earth North West.
- ARROW 5 – Hydrogeological Assessment of Whitemoss Landfill on behalf of ARROW by Hannah Fraser of H Fraser Consulting Ltd
- ARROW 6 – Whitemoss Additional Comments and Sustainability – Alan Watson (Public Interest Consultants).
- ARROW 7 – This submission
- ARROW 8 –Comments on Q1.8 in the Second round of written questions prepared on behalf of ARROW by Hannah Fraser of H Fraser Consulting Ltd

**3. Whitemoss Landfill Ltd states:** “It appears that ARROW is also linked by personnel and registered office to the Maharishi Foundation.”

**Arrow replies:** Arrow is a not for profit company limited by guarantee (see point 1 above). It is independent of any other company, charity, or organisation.

Arrow has its registered office in Beacon House, an office block in Skelmersdale which houses many different businesses, from a property company to a machine electronics company. Beacon House is owned by a private company. That company is not linked with the Maharishi Foundation, which is a charity.

It is quite wrong, as confirmed by Rosie Cooper MP who describes it as “dishonest” and “disingenuous”, for Whitemoss Landfill Ltd to claim links between Arrow and organisations with which individuals associated with Arrow may be affiliated such as the Maharishi Foundation – for example, through their employment. To do so would be equivalent to claiming that a swimming club that has members who work for a bank or a brewery is “linked” to the bank or the brewery. This would be a ludicrous claim with no basis in law or common sense.