

# Comment for planning application WSCC/028/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/028/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Phil Huggins"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="GREENACRE CLOSE, 2, GREENACRE CLOSE, PULBOROUGH, RH20 4QG"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Comment"/>
Comments	<p>I'm commenting this as an individual although have also forwarded it to the Sussex Wildlife Trust for review.</p> <p>My comments are :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Landscape level development such as this one need to be considered against other projects impacting the environment in the vicinity. I understand that there are others but have not seen these.</li><li>2. There will inevitably be traffic, noise and dust originating from the alternative proposal to infill the quarry. What monitoring mechanisms will be in place to ensure that these remain within projections?</li><li>3. What controls and checks will exist on testing 'inert' in-fill materials. Will these be made public?</li><li>4. Assessment of the alternative from an ecological viewpoint is clearly more attractive than allowing a deep lake to fill with ground water. However, I'm not convinced that enough is being done to mitigate the impacts on key current breeding species or in monitoring the results of implementation over the years.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4.1 On Peregrine nesting: can alternative nesting options be provided around the estate now before work starts to encourage the existing pair to relocate; what discussions have taken place with experts in this field and furthermore what has been done to prevent drone disturbance going forwards.</li><li>4.2 Artificial Sand Martin banks are not always successful but the intention to build some is a good move. However, for the transition period, can nesting options on neighbouring nature sites be explored and improved before work starts to encourage greater numbers to the general area hence increasing the breeding pool for re-colonisation of the new landscape when it becomes ready.</li><li>4.3 I would like to see proposals expanded to i) provide suitable bat colony roosting locations ii) introduce and support Dormice and other struggling species into the new landscape iii) include additional and quantified bird nesting boxes into the alternative landscape.</li><li>4.4 The alternative plan should deliver real benefits as explained. What mechanisms will be in place to monitor the delivery to this plan (time, quality) and what information will be made public? I would like to see in the public domain i) annual check of actual progress achievement generally and habitat development particularly vs that planned ii) full species surveys of completed areas of land after 3,5,7,9 years and at completion.</li></ol></li></ol>
Received	<input type="text" value="19/08/2021 15:44:04"/>
Attachments	