

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

*The Manchester Guardian (1901-1959); Aug 29, 1929;*

Now Goyt Valley is threatened. This time the offender is the Stockport Water Board. For over two years the Board has secretly purchased private estates, which include Goyt's Bridge, Errwood, and Chilsworth Powder Mills, with the intention of building a couple of reservoirs. No one will deny the necessity of more water reserves and more reservoirs to hold them. But why should Stockport withhold its intentions from public criticism? If the Board had nothing to fear and certainly, in view of the recent drought, nothing to expect but support from the public, why was it necessary to indulge in tactics of secrecy? Possibly there was a chance of the public's asking whether the Board had really taken every step that was in its power to find an alternative site. If this was so, then Goyt Valley, beautiful as it was and important a spot for recreation and health as it was claimed to be, would have had to go before the greater need of water. But the policy of the Board suggests that the promoters were aware of an alternative site, but were determined to have Goyt Valley. It is, however, not too late to oppose the scheme, for the public can yet prevail upon the Government to veto the proposal, which has yet to be sanctioned.

In any case, it is not too much to demand that in future all public or private concerns be compelled to lay their cards upon the table and for our beauty spots, like our ancient monuments, to be scheduled and protected.—  
Yours, &c., H. S.

Belfast, August 28.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

*The Manchester Guardian (1901-1959); Sep 5, 1929;*

### STOCKPORT AND THE GOYT VALLEY.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Guardian.*

Sir,—The Stockport Corporation's reply to the protests against the construction of reservoirs in Goyt Valley make it necessary to add a few remarks to my previous letter.

The Corporation claims that the scheme could not be carried out secretly, and that the procedure of purchasing the necessary ground was merely diplomatic, not being desirous of "announcing with trumpets and drums" that it was in the market to buy. This fails to convince those who may demand why no alternative site was thought of. I pointed out in my last letter that if no alternative could be found, there could be no reasonable opposition to a necessary scheme. But all that the Corporation can say is that, as the scheme is essential to Stockport, "it would be carrying aestheticism too far" to obstruct it. That does not answer the reasonable question whether any attempt was made to spare the Goyt Valley.

If the Corporation had "trumpeted" their intentions, possibly the public would have acquired the land and handed it over to a body like the National Trust. The importance of Goyt Valley as a tourist centre to such towns as Buxton and Whaley Bridge, inasmuch as there is no other spot so lauded for the variety of scenery it affords in the immediate vicinity, should have made Stockport consider the possibilities of serious opposition from those towns dependent upon its beauty. Already a petition is being drafted to prevail upon Parliament to veto the scheme.

I would suggest that the time is still open to the Corporation to retrieve itself by offering the required land to be bought by public subscription, equivalent to the outlay expended on the original purchase. I am sure that the popularity of Goyt Valley would make the public respond generously, and such an offer would help to enlist public support from outside as well as inside Stockport to give the Corporation the necessary powers to purchase compulsorily an alternative site that will achieve the purpose of an efficient water supply.—  
Yours, &c., H. S.

Belfast, Sept 2.