

Comment for planning application WSCC/045/20

Application number	WSCC/045/20
Name	Jonathan Millbanks
Address	FOXWELLS, 4, FOXWELLS, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH17 6LZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>In essence, this objection can be summed up by the heading 'There is no need for this development'. There is no demonstrable local or national demand addressed by the application. In a world suffering from a Climate Crisis, where governments have pledged to net zero emissions within our lifetime, the application is sheer folly. The proposed development is situated in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where the presumption is against industrialisation of this type - except in exceptional circumstance. The circumstances giving rise to the application are just not exceptional and thus should be rejected. It fails to demonstrate how it will contribute to natural capital or how it will contribute to a low carbon, circular economy. In terms of Highway safety, adequacy of parking/loading/turning and traffic generation, this application would be a disaster for Balcombe. The number of proposed vehicle movements is staggering, and is the equivalent of placing a medium sized semi-industrial park just outside of the village. Our infrastructure is just not equipped to cope with this level and size of vehicle. The impact on both the public amenity and health should not be underestimated. One automatically thinks of the dangers associated with the toxic processes the site will be involved with. However, it is important not to minimise how much additional pollution the vehicle movement will bring as well. I have real concerns about the numbers of large vehicle passing the primary school (particularly with some of the substances they will be carrying). The school is effectively situated below ground level, thus any pollution immediately begins to congregate in their front playgrounds and classrooms. This is exacerbated at the current time due to the need for ventilation brought about by the Covid-19 crisis. Angus' application does not adequately address how this will impact on the village and potential loss of amenity, it also glosses over any potential issues with public health in a nonchalant way. This is not acceptable. There is an unknowable risk to the water table around Balcombe. The integrity of the bore and well is questionable and any further work is likely to allow contaminants directly into water. Far from Angus addressing a need, they actually stand to create a new need for clean water in this area. The proposals in the development plan are thin on detail, and in many places factually incorrect. Whilst I'm sure it was not their intention to be dishonest in their application, the lack of attention to detail and supposition presented as fact exposes the true character and nature of this company. It exists on wafer thin margins, desperately seeking any new venture to appease its penny share holders. This precarious existence leads it to cut corners (as see in the application) in an industry where to do so invites disaster. The fact that Angus assert that they have consulted with the emergency services in relation to the emergency action plan has been proven to be false. On the contrary, WSFRS are demanding the site plan be updated - as it hasn't been done since Cuadrilla left in 2013. This is shoddy and lackadaisical, speaking volumes for the regard in which they hold safety and the local community. Furthermore, in view of the current wave of crippling protests that Extinction Rebellion seem able to inflict at will, to permit this development would be to invite a nightmare to the locality. Strategically this site is extremely vulnerable and it would not take a massive protest to bring the entire area to a standstill. The impact on major transport networks would be immense and the cost of policing this vast - especially if no Home Office support was forthcoming. In conclusion, this is the same application that was withdrawn a few months ago - just presented differently. The time scales are the same, most of the information remains the same (only presented differently), therefore the outcome should remain the same; 'This application would represent a major development in the High Weald AONB, for which there are no exceptional circumstances, and which is not in the public interest.' The application should be refused.</p>
Received	27/09/2020 09:50:50
Attachments	