

Comment for planning application WSCC/007/24

Application number	WSCC/007/24
Name	Jonathan Rowland
Address	THE COTTAGE, BRANTRIDGE LANE, BRANTRIDGE LANE, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH17 6EN
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	Objection to Planning Ref: WSCC/007/24

We write in objection to the wetland wate water treatment proposal by Southern Water. This objection arises in the main through a lack of engagement and information from the applicant as to the necessity and reasons for selecting this option for treatment that has such a large visual impact for the village. There is no mention in the Application of the current, unacceptable levels of discharge nor of what the proposal has been designed to reduce them to. This would enable the efficacy of the installation to be measured and its ongoing operational performances enforced both by the Environment Agency and West Sussex LPA.

Whilst we are greatly in favour of improving the condition of the river Ouse and the environment in general, this lack of explanation in the Application leaves us with significant concerns and questions that we believe should be answered by Southern Water to the satisfaction of the local community and the Environment Agency as well as WSCC's Planning Department. This concern is more significant given the fact that the science behind the proposed solution is somewhat experimental. The concerns that we would like addressed are:

1. What other treatment options exist and why has this solution been selected above the others in an AONB?
 - a. What are its potential negative impacts of this solution and how are these to be mitigated?
 - b. Will the proposal be effective, especially in times of low rainfall?
 - c. Will the proposal be adversely affected by runoff from the adjacent fields which could lead to silting or further contamination from Pesticides and fertilisers?
 - d. Will the wetland area become polluted over time and need remediation to remove these contaminants in the future?
2. Does this solution have the potential to produce odours or a risk of mosquitos and flies? How would this be managed - The prevailing wind direction would blow these straight across the whole village.
3. Traffic and disruption from the operational phase of the proposal is missing from the submission. What are the likely traffic impacts in the operation and maintenance phases or does this solution provide a benefit in this regard? If so, why is an additional car park required when there is an existing one that should suffice that is located at the current treatment site?
4. What is the frequency of the short, medium and long term requirements for maintenance of the proposed wetlands element?
 - a. Will these have the potential to impact on the village a) when being undertaken, and b) if not undertaken by SW in the future?
 - b. What assurances are there that the necessary maintenance will be performed to prevent any negative impacts on the community given SW poor record in this regard?
5. The extent of the dam walls that form the four cells/ponds and the access roads sited on top of them along with the new car park, 'industrialises' the setting when compared to the current arrangements. Further screening is recommended in the Application but does not appear in the Landscaping proposals. The WSCC Arboricultural Report makes recommendations for enhancement of the proposals in its penultimate paragraph that we completely endorse, particularly those along the Cuckfield Road /Eastern Boundary. These should be a Condition of any Approval.

In view of my comments above, I greatly hope that the Application will not be granted until the questions raised have been answered to the satisfaction of the local community and the Environment Agency as well as WSCC's Planning Department.

Received 06/03/2024 11:27:54

Attachments