

Comment for planning application WSCC/028/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/028/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Daniel Till"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="SPRING GARDENS, 16, SPRING GARDENS, PULBOROUGH, RH20 3BS"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Statement of objection to planning application WSCC/028/21 on the following bases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduced quality of life for local residence as a direct result of significantly increased traffic, congestion, noise and air pollutionDamage to wildlife both within the quarry itself and the surrounding areas due to activity within the quarry as well as the aforementioned noise and air pollution caused by vehicular trafficSignificant risk of contamination to aquifer running beneath quarryDamage to scenery, site will be visible and increased traffic audible from picturesque walking areas upon the south downs such as Chanctonbury Ring <p>With regards to the application itself and supporting documents of, I take objection to the intentionally misleading manner in which it has been worded in places. Implying that the primary aim is the continued extraction of sand/mineral from the quarry as well as restoration, when in actuality it is the infill of inert waste which is at least part of the primary objective. Showcased in the accompanying letter provided by Terrestria whereby the proposal synopsis is "THE CONTINUED EXTRACTION OF MINERAL AND THE SUBSEQUENT RESTORATION OF ROCK COMMON QUARRY", with mention to the infill only located within the body of text.</p> <p>Having recently moved to the area already with some reservations on air quality, the idea that the already high traffic levels in the locality could increase by up to 500 lorry movements per day is mortifying. The implication that this is foremost a "restoration plan" is simply offensive.</p> <p>In response to the Non-technical Summaries "Do Nothing" Option, which should more accurately be called "Do exactly what we previously agreed upon": Whilst the previously agreed flooding of the quarry does indeed cause concern with regards to contamination from the former neighbouring landfill sites, the implication that a deep-water body is a "danger to human health" in and of itself is ridiculous, is that to say we should for example ban ponds? Or perhaps we ought to outlaw the sea?</p> <p>With regards to the "Restore Sooner" option, which should more accurately be called "Backfill with waste to earn a few extra quid": If this application is to be considered then at the very least it should be defined exactly what waste would be "stored" within the quarry as I highly doubt "inert restoration material" as it has so graciously been worded would be its conventional name.</p> <p>Making safe of the existing landscape whilst continuing to pump water from the quarry until the time comes when no longer required is clearly preferred given the now known leakage from the old neighbouring landfill site. The notion floated in the "Continue Pumping" option that a bowl feature wouldn't be in keeping with its surroundings is nonsense, once eventually reclaimed by nature and part wooded it would if anything be an interesting feature and certainly the most positive in terms of CO2 reduction and wildlife resurgence.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="31/08/2021 19:50:52"/>
Attachments	