

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: WSCC/028/21 OBJECTION
Date: 11 August 2021 21:12:09
Attachments: [Katie Golds Objection Supporting Information.pdf](#)

[REDACTED]

I strongly object to this planning application. This proposal contains four planning applications in one. I object to all four.

I highlight my main reasons below and would like to draw your attention to my attachment which contains accompanying images/video links.

Noise/Dust Receptors

I would like the applicant to explain why the nearest property Rock House Nurseries, situated only 20 meters from the proposed site boundary, has been repeatedly excluded and blatantly disregarded throughout the application.

Photographs of receptors cut out the property – see supporting information **Images 1-2** attached. Page 7 of the Noise Survey identifies this property as 'receptor 1', yet in 2.3 it is not even mentioned! The property is not included at all in dust receptor survey table 6.3. Why, when it is the right next to the site?

See **Video 1** for an example of the dust levels that this property currently has to contend with! Has Washington Campsite been given proper consideration in this application? The campsite is immediately adjacent to the quarry and campers will be subjected to any increase in dust and noise, both of which will be significant.

Water Quality

This site is located immediately adjacent to a household landfill site. Page 249 Vol.2 Part 1 states "Based on these predicted groundwater contours there is a high potential that the base of the landfill is already submerged, particularly in the northern part of the site." Rock Quarry is below the water table. This water is continuously pumped into Honeybridge Stream, entering our water system. At the northern part of household landfill site adjacent to the footpath 2604, it is leaking leachate (reported 6 times, **Images 3-4** attached). How can you guarantee the leachate from this dump is not going to enter this major aquifer? In Environment agencies guidance notes section E1, it states that they will object to landfill sites on or in a principle aquifer. What will happen as the water level in the quarry is allowed to rise?

Why do they propose to reopen the closed tunnel in Windmill Quarry to transport material from the processing site into Rock Common Quarry when planning application WSCC/016/15/WS states: "At no time whatsoever, shall the backfilled conveyor tunnel between the Windmill Landfill site and Rock Common Sand Pit under The Hollow be reopened." How can you guarantee this is not opening up a direct route for leachate from one site to the other? Can you ensure vibrations will not cause the quarry cliff and The Hollow road to collapse?

Furthermore, why is the processing site being allocated in the basin of a household landfill site? When it rains, the currently leaking leachate from the adjacent landfill site is being washed downhill into the stream. In 2019, there was a major pollution alert at this location <https://www.wscountytimes.co.uk/news/transport/mystery-deaths-1000-fish-south-downs-village-157085>. Can the applicants categorically say that the major aquifer is not going to be contaminated? Can they guarantee Honeybridge stream is not /will not be contaminated?

Flooding

Volume 2 part 1 appendix B & Volume 1 section 6, 6.3

The only reference to groundwater flooding is over 1700 metres away at Hole Street/A24 Ashington (no date given). This claim is false and is extremely disrespectful for residents of The Hollow that have suffered severe property damage. See my supporting information **Images 5-7** for just some examples of this.

How can the applicants ensure the water levels of Honeybridge Stream are not going to be impacted? Are they aware of how much surface water/run off is already present in this area?

Nature

I would like to draw your attention to the Great Crested Newt survey. Within the last few years there has been multiple sightings of GCN's adjacent to this quarry- **Images 8 to 11** attached. The survey found no evidence of their existence but:

- 1) At minimum survey requires 3 visits between mid-April and mid-May; only 1 visit was done late May. Furthermore they tested only for DNA. In a quarry this size, this is like testing for a drop in the ocean.
- 2) 3 ponds were identified as suitable habitats, and were then filled in by the quarry workings before the survey could be done! (Vol 2 part 2, 2.2.1).
- 3) Pond 22 was not sampled for 'safety reasons'. This is the most likely habitat of the newts based on the locations of sightings. They then include a photo by the pond in Table 14, so how was it not accessible?
- 4) ALL ponds should be tested, but the explanation for not doing so is COVID-19?

Regarding other species that were identified, it shows the quarry is a fantastic nature reserve. There are breeding peregrine falcons and sand martins, insects of NATIONAL importance just to name a few; yet this application contains **NO MITIGATING MEASURES** for this rare and very special wildlife.

How can they use the statement that the site is dangerous as justification for this habitat destruction? The water is no more dangerous than for example the beach, and it is not even open to the public! The application itself states the site is securely fenced. The cliffs are currently stable, without further quarrying and vibrating conveyor tunnels to disturb them.

Another point that should be mentioned is that this site will be located at the foot of the South Downs National Park and the workings will be fully visible from the South Downs, notably Chanctonbury Ring.

Transport

Volume 2 part 2 appendix F quotes HGV and road safety figures from 2015-2019 to justify the increase in traffic of 500 HGV movements. This is like comparing apples and pears; the Biffa site was not in operation during these years. Taking the data from 2000-2004 when in full operation, shows 36 accidents compared to 4 minor accidents; 5 were serious and 1 was fatal. You must also consider that there is far more traffic now on the A283 than 20 years ago! What are the predicted accident numbers based on these figures instead?

The image in Appendix C HGV Swept Path Analysis for Landfill Access is notable, and clearly shows 2 HGV will not be able to pass each other. The road cannot be widened as it is on the edge of a cliff. See **Image 12** attached.

Currently HGV's transporting sand out of the quarry exit The Hollow via the A24, adjacent to Rock Business Park. The application states any HGV's carrying the landfill material will be using the opposite end of The Hollow, the junction with the A283. How are they going to control this? Are the sand transportation lorries still going to be entering the site via the quarry entrance? What about the machines that, for example, will be spreading the materials? Will these be kept inside the quarry, or driven to and from the opposite entrance every morning and evening for storage? No consideration has been given to the significant daily noise impact to the adjacent residential property, or road safety.

Sustainability

I find it extremely hard to believe that all the inert waste will come from within 10 miles and the quarry will be filled in less than 10 years. The adjacent household landfill site has still never been restored to the agreed plan due to 'lack of material'. Along with this, Sandgate Park Quarry in Storrington (only 2km away) has just had application WSCC/044/18/SR approved to import 1.8 million tonnes of inert material over 11 years. Where is all the local waste coming from? To import inert waste into this downland village from all over the country is not sustainable.

Residents could realistically be facing decades of further disruptive activity.

Why are things already been dumped in the quarry and covered over if they do not have planning permission (**Images 13-14/Video 2** attached)?

The facts above are just some of the reasons that this application should be REFUSED.

Katie Golds

