

# Comment for planning application WSCC/028/21

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Application number | <input type="text" value="WSCC/028/21"/>   |
| Name               | <input type="text" value="Peter Sullivan"/>  |
| Address            | <input type="text" value="DOWNSFOLD, LONDON ROAD, LONDON ROAD, PULBOROUGH, RH20 4AL"/>   |
| Type of Comment    | <input type="text" value="Objection"/>   |
| Comments           | <p>I'm writing to formally object to the proposed application for Rock Quarry. I'm making my objection on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* Movements of up to 500 Heavy Goods Vehicles a day. We already receive an inordinate number of large HGV vehicles that use the Washington turn as a way to manage traffic in and out of site at present. Traffic on the A24 and A283 is already very heavy and requires no additional incentive to increase this.</li><li>* There would be a significant impact on local businesses such as Washington and Caravan Camp, the Hollow, Rock Business Park etc..... local businesses which should be supported by the local authorities and people elected to represent them. If this application were to proceed, then I don't believe it's representative of doing the right things for local people and the local area as a whole.</li><li>* Importation of waste and quality of air. The application states that inert waste will be brought in, but it does not state what types of inert waste. The simple fact is that when fact waste (to be clear, this was landfill waste!) was imported and buried previously, it's now been identified that the area where it was buried is sinking and leachate has been leaking into the local aquifer which provides a water source for a large population in West Sussex. Once again, this is not representing local people and voters of Storrington, Washington, Pulborough and Steyning areas. It's clearly demonstrated that despite assurances previously, conditions relating to the operation and ongoing use of the quarry are overlooked when not convenient to the operating parties and my fear and suspicion is that this will just continue.</li><li>* National Park status. It doesn't matter if the quarry was already in existence before the Southdowns was granted NP status, surely this must provide some protections to the land, local area and the National Park as a whole? I believed that the award of National Park status was to preserve special areas of land, nature and conservation. Please explain to me where mining operations fits into this brief?</li><li>* As per award of National Park status, the Southdowns is blessed with a wide variety of local wildlife and habitats. There are a large number of species (some protected) in the proposed area that have not been considered or factored into the plans being proposed.</li><li>* Non conformance to the process concerning surveys around wildlife and habitats. . An example of this is the newt survey where a minimum of 4 x surveys should have been conducted but only one has actually been done. Local Authorities and Planning Committees hold residents responsible to conduct all relevant surveys and requirements when it comes to developments of their own properties or areas, but when it comes to big business, we conveniently overlook this? I come back again to the fact that the proposed application falls in an area that has been awarded National Park status and is an AONB. Such status is meant to protect and conserve the land and habitats that fall within the area.</li><li>* I'm certain when the application of a quarry was first granted, that it was conditional on restoration taking place. I would reference a local example at Goodwood Estate (which incidentally Dudmans operated) and which they were removing materials such as sand from historically over the last 20 years etc....However, this was and has been fully restored. Contractually, Dudmans we're obligated to do this. If there is insufficient material, then it can be purchased and transported in. To be clear, Landfill is not classed as restoration material. It's very convenient that such a 'generic' term of 'inert waste' has been used.</li></ul> <p>This has now been the third application over the past twenty years which has requested the use of the quarry for what is essentially landfill. It's been rejected two previous times for simple clear reasons in that it provides no benefit to the local area in terms of its residents, its local businesses and environmental and conservational considerations. Nothing has changed since then except the fact that the Southdowns has been awarded National Park status which should only increase the protections and preservation that this beautiful area holds. Please reject this application and ensure that the quarry and land is restored to the agreed conditions as what was originally proposed.</p> |

Yours faithfully

Peter Sullivan

Received

22/08/2021 10:39:08

Attachments