

Comment for planning application WSCC/028/21

Application number	WSCC/028/21
Name	Storrington & Sullington Parish
Address	PARISH HALL, THAKEHAM ROAD, THAKEHAM ROAD, PULBOROUGH, RH20 3PP
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>Storrington and Sullington Parish Council - Rock Common Quarry Response January 2023</p> <p>One of Storrington and Sullington Parish Council's main concerns is the significant increase in traffic this application is predicted to create, especially when combined with the additional lorry movements Rampion 2 will generate. Page 15 of the report states that there would be 112 movements per week and only an additional 10 (max) for imports. Yet page 61 states 'the total number of daily movements associated with the importation of restoration material is around 300 daily 2-way movements'. This is only one example that demonstrates that the application is deeply flawed throughout.</p> <p>The data used is outdated, such as using rainfall data from the 1970s and flow data from the 1960s. The survey assessing the impact of increased traffic was conducted during a one week period in October 2021, when there would still have been significant reduction in traffic due to effects of the COVID pandemic, and is, regardless, an extremely short period of time in which to conclude that a potential increase of 600 lorries will not have an adverse effect on the area. Environmental and ecological surveys are considered highly subjective and new independent surveys should be required. Scientific parameters need to be questioned and the whole application does not stand up to scrutiny.</p> <p>The current water that accumulates at the quarry is filtered to try and remove leachate, so it is unclear how the report can state that future pumping would not be needed if there is a fear of contamination from the nearby domestic refuse site. If leachate contamination is not a problem in the future, and a clay liner is not now required, it is also unclear why the site cannot be left to rewild naturally. The continuity or cessation of pumping is an additional subject which creates contradictions within the application. As long as there is a risk of groundwater being contaminated by leachate there is a legal obligation to continue pumping and filtering the water, not to do so would break environmental law.</p> <p>While this application has described the intent to create a country park and espoused the environmental merits of this, it should be noted that their own report is clearly biased and not making a balanced argument in debating the most beneficial future for the site. The quarry is presently home to many species of animals, such as Sand Martins and Falcons, whose nesting habitats will be negatively affected by the application. Destroying the current habitat and increasing the traffic on our roads does not appear to make this an environmentally beneficial application.</p> <p>It should also be noted that nearby Milford Grange (another former quarry) was also supposed to be a country park and while one has been created, this has been alongside 75 houses; and as no one wanted to take responsibility for the park it is now managed and paid for by Washington Parish Council. Accepting inert materials at Rock Common Quarry will generate enormous profits, which may not be offset by comparable environmental benefit.</p> <p>It was noted that the Flood Authority objects as the risk of flooding to the site is deemed significant (surface water) and high (groundwater) and no plans have been put forward to mitigate this.</p> <p>While this application was given extended time for public response, it does not appear to have been altered since it was first opened up for discussion and has therefore not taken into consideration any of the numerous concerns over traffic (including concerns over peak volumes on already busy roads, the absence of traffic calming measures, or creation of safe crossings), loss of amenity/biodiversity or financial loss (due to traffic and pollution), or the proposed timeframe.</p> <p>Concerning the proposed timeframe, it is questionable whether 8-10 years would be sufficient to complete the infill project, especially considering the reduction in development in the area due to the water neutrality issues we face, which have no immediate solution. This will result in either a far longer timeframe or the quarry accepting inert material from a greater distance away, increasing pollution and traffic. Similar sites are known to have been granted a series of extensions to their timeframe which would be highly unbeneficial for this area.</p> <p>At the very least, this application should be deferred until new surveys are undertaken which reference up-to-date data and address the many inconsistencies currently present and the concerns of</p>

local residents. WSCC need to appreciate the full impact on air and noise pollution, road quality, and excessive traffic of the combined applications for Rock Common Quarry and Rampion 2. If this application is permitted, clearly worded, unambiguous conditions need to be set that WSCC are capable of verifying and enforcing. One of these conditions should state that inert waste will not come via Storrington High Street as this will negatively affect our noise and air pollution, the condition of our roads, and will increase the danger to pedestrians. We would require a condition that bans any site traffic from entering the AQMA covering the whole of Storrington High Street.

Received

18/01/2023 14:15:54

Attachments