

I object to this proposal on the following grounds:

1. There is not adequate evidence that it is necessary
2. It will have an excessive negative impact on those close to the site, users of the local area, and to East Grinstead as a whole.
3. The transport plan is self-evidently dangerous considering the state of the roads and the types of road user on these roads.

In more detail with reasoning:

1. There is not adequate evidence that it is necessary

The council needs to consider if the evidence that the applicant presents is reliable enough to base a decision on. I believe the evidence is not trustworthy and overplays the risks of the site for the following reasons:

- I know that my neighbours grazed horses on the site for some years up to about three years ago. The horses were free to graze the whole pasture site and not confined to a narrow strip of land. There were no injuries to their horses. An ex-part owner of the site also grazed her horses there up to the point she moved away. The move was not because of danger to the horses.
- The applicant claims the site may be a danger to human health. However, the applicant is currently running the site as a commercial campsite. Surely the applicant can't be charging members of the public to camp on a site that may be damaging their health.
- The pictures of trees they show dying on the land look very like Ash trees which are dying everywhere due to Ash die-back.
- It is evident from aerial site photographs that the care home submitted in their objection that the site has been previously capped and is reasonable rough pasture and not littered with surface waste.
- The ground investigation report is out of date and provides scanty evidence that any leaching away from the waste mass was happening at the time. The only evidence of actual leaching was in the intermittent stream as it didn't meet the national standards for a clean fresh water stream. However no comparative analysis was made of how it compares to other similar streams in the area (or nationally). It may be that the stream is not as polluted as it is made out to be.
- There is no discussion about whether the capping activity itself could negatively affect the stability of the waste.
- Surely the Council must consider the fact that there is a very strong financial incentive for the applicant to provide evidence that the cap is needed and that basing a decision purely on the evidence provided must be approached with extreme caution.

2. It will have an excessive negative impact on those close to the site, users of the local area and to East Grinstead as a whole.

- Although the applicant has proposed building up the outskirts of the site first it will not fully mitigate the noise impact of the site. Residents nearby will be subjected to the noise of reversing machinery six days a week and the dust will be damaging to air quality and health.
- The provisions made for the care home next door are entirely inadequate and the lives of its vulnerable residents is going to be blighted by this activity.
- There are a number of nursery schools nearby. One which is mainly an outdoor nursery is adjacent to the site. The children will be exposed to noise and dust.
- The whole area is an amenity area where residents of East Grinstead and visitors further afield go for leisure. This capping activity will seriously damage users' enjoyment of the area. Especially users of Rocking Hill Wood (which is adjacent) and the wider Standen estate.
- The residents of St Hill Green are going to be particularly effected with having so many HGV tipper trucks going past their houses, especially the bungalows on the corner.
- The application works on the assumption that the capping will take 80 weeks. However, there is no guarantee that this is the case. Once the go ahead is given it could take much longer and if it does there is nothing that the Council can really do about it as it must go to completion once started.

3. The transport plan is self-evidently dangerous considering the state of the roads and the types of road user on these roads

Predictably, the transport plan and survey say the activity is not going to have a significant effect on safety or road traffic. However to anyone who has actually seen these roads this is evidently not true. The risk of accidents will increase and there is going to be a big increase in road use and congestion with these extra HGV journeys.

- The plan gives the impression that there will be a certain number of HGV journeys a day and that they will be spread out evenly throughout the day. Of course this will not be how it will actually work. There is likely to be times when many HGVs are going to want access at the same time and also there may be days with many more HGV journeys. No account is made in the plan of the effect of this in safety and congestion.
- The current traffic flow report provided is not based on a big enough sample. It wasn't done for long enough. It should be done to assess flows at different times of day and on different days.
- In the latest transport report they add the daily flow of extra HGVs to a table taken from the previous transport report. If you look in the previous report it clearly says the table represents weekly traffic flows. They have therefore added the "current" weekly HGV traffic to the extra daily traffic and said it causes a negligible increase. If you work out what the extra weekly HGV traffic would be and add it to the "current" weekly traffic the effect is very significant.
- Personal experience shows me that few HGVs use the roads at the moment and that an increase of the scale they suggest is going to cause lots of traffic flow problems

and collision incidents. The roads are narrow in many places. Meeting the bus is a major incident when driving, what is it going to be like meeting all these HGVs?

- The report takes no account of walkers or cyclists on the roads. Walkers use pavement-less West Hoathly Road and particularly pavement-less St Hill Road as there is a lot of foot traffic from St Hill Manor. It is clear that all these extra HGVs on the roads will increase the risk of death to walkers and cyclists significantly.
- The proposed speed restriction on West Hoathly Road and a priority system may help around the site entrance/exit. However, there are other portions of West Hoathly Road where two large vehicles will not be able to pass. There are often problems on these when a car and the bus meet. It's going to cause a massive problem when the HGVs meet each other
- The left hand turning at St Hill Green onto West Hoathly Road is dangerous as West Hoathly road comes out of a blind bend just before it and is very narrow at this point. The HGVs will have to turn wide and collisions here are very likely.
- The turning right onto Imberhorne Lane at St Hill Green is also very difficult, even in a car the shape of the junction makes it awkward. It's likely that the HGVs will drive over and damage St Hill Green itself. If there is a car at the junction coming out of Imberhorne Lane onto West Hoathly Road when an HGV is turning right, the HGV will not be able to turn.
- No account is made of the safety round Imberhorne School which the route passes.
- The crossing from Imberhorne Lane to St Hill Road is also difficult and all these HGV crossings are going to increase danger.
- Before the Council makes any decision on this plan, I urge them to make an independent safety assessment of the route. It is clearly a dangerous proposal, particularly to pedestrians. These roads are not suitable for large numbers of HGVs.