

Comment for planning application WSCC/028/21

Application number	WSCC/028/21
Name	Patricia Golds
Address	Rock House Nurseries The Hollow Washington West Sussex RH20 3DA
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>I STRONGLY OBJECT</p> <p>Why does this application contain 4 planning applications in 1?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Continued winning & working of sand (WS/15/97)2. Continued importation of aggregates up to 10,000 tonnes (DC/2151/07)3. Importation of soils and peats (DC/554/05) <p>All of these permissions expired on 31.12.2020 but have been allowed to continue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Variation of the approved restoration plan. <p>Why have I not been given the opportunity to comment on these individually?</p> <p>My home lies 20 metres from the proposed site boundary and the access point for construction/restoration heavy plant vehicles. It is therefore a significant receptor for noise, dust and pollution and yet it is repeatedly ignored in the applicants proposals.</p> <p>NOISE (Volume 2 part 2 appendix D) & (Volume 1 section 6 part 6.5)</p> <p>This whole assessment is confusing and misleading. At no point has construction/restoration heavy plant noise readings been included relating to it passing just 20 metres from my home, this assessment is flawed and should be discounted.</p> <p>The increase in operation hours (currently the operators do not work Saturdays and finish at 17.00 hours weekdays) would be very intrusive.</p> <p>AIR QUALITY & DUST (Volume 2 part 2 appendix E)</p> <p>Although my home has been identified by the applicants as a key receptor being within 20 metres of the site (figure A2) it was not included in the applicants report. Why? Is this a deliberate act as we are obviously very severely affected? Again this report is flawed and should be discounted.</p> <p>TRANSPORT (Volume 2 part 2 appendix F)</p> <p>The applicant seems confused over the number of HGV movements associated with the site, is it 300 or 500 movements a day? They quote that when Biffa Waste company used the proposed Windmill site access they had a similar number of HGV movements i.e. 500 a day. They provide accident data from 2015-2019 to prove there had been only 4 slight accidents near the junction of The Hollow and A283 road. But this period had very little HGV movements. If you look at past crash data to when Biffa were using this junction during final restoration of the Windmill site in 2000-2004 it is much more alarming. There were 36 recorded accidents, sadly 1 fatal and 5 serious. I discount their theory of this junction being safe!</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL</p> <p>Where does the Environment agency stand on the dumping of inert material into a major aquifer? Their own guidance notes quote in section E1 that they will object to landfill sites on or in a principle aquifer.</p> <p>Where does the environment agency stand on the processing site being allocated in the basin of a former non-inert landfill site (The Windmill site)?</p> <p>How does the applicant intend to reopen the old disused tunnel in the Windmill Quarry to transport material from the processing site into Rock Common quarry when planning application WSCC/016/15/WS clearly states -</p> <p>Conveyor Tunnel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. "At no time whatsoever, shall the backfilled conveyor tunnel between the Windmill Landfill site and Rock Common Sand Pit under The Hollow be reopened." <p>REASON: In the interests of satisfactory restoration of the site and the protection of groundwater quality.</p> <p>FLOODING (Volume 2 part 1 appendix B) & (Volume 1 section 6, 6.3)</p> <p>The only reference to groundwater flooding according to the applicants is over 1700 metres away at Hole Street/A24 Ashington (no date provided) this is an outrageous claim, homes and businesses in The Hollow were severely affected by flooding in October 2000 and again in January 2008.</p> <p>ECOLOGY</p> <p>A wildlife survey was conducted and many species including endangered rare breeds, such as Peregrine Falcon, Sand Martins, Dormouse, Linnets and Grest-Crested Newts were found, the applicants admit that there would be a total loss of all habitat and wildlife in the quarry due to the massive disturbance.</p> <p>NEED</p> <p>Has Rock Common Quarry been identified as a site for inert landfill? Has it been included in the Waste local plan? Does this application go against the West Sussex "zero waste to landfill" by 2031</p>

aspiration?

Is there enough inert material to fill the 7.3 million cubic metre hole? They estimate 8-10 years to fill it with 2.7 million cubic metres, that is just one third full, what happens after this? This project could and probably would, if allowed, last for decades.

Washington and its residents have had to live with 100 years of quarrying and decades of landfilling. I have lived next to this quarry for over 33 years myself.

It is not in the public interest, it is located on a major aquifer, there is insufficient information provided and it will have a detrimental impact on the local amenity.

This application should be REFUSED.

Received

30/07/2021 14:31:57

Attachments