

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Samantha Curling
Address	WYKINFOLD, TISMANS COMMON, TISMANS COMMON, HORSHAM, RH12 3BJ
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>Further to my letter of objection last year I write to again strongly object to this planning application. The additional information submitted by the applicant continues to fail to address any of the fundamental policy, environmental or local community concerns, and, for the record, I fully endorse the multiple specific points of objection that have been expressed in significant numbers by other individuals. The applicant appears to be in a desperate straw clutching exercise to either discredit or exclude those people who care so deeply that this application is totally unjustified, from having a further say on this matter. It should not matter where you live to be able to comment on this objection. It feeds into the national narrative about the environment, biodiversity and habitat loss. Logically in fact, if the applicant wants to bring waste from wherever they choose and send clay to wherever they choose, not limited by postcode, then there should be no limit as to who should be able to make a comment. The implications are far more wide reaching than just for those in the immediate area of the proposed site.</p> <p>Whilst the applicant may not like the WSCC waste and mineral policy, it does have to comply with it. The place to have it changed is not in this planning application. I will state again that this application has nothing to do with the supply of clay into the market for brick brickmaking. There is no shortage of brick clay. Speaking to a client recently who is an independent brick and stone supplier, he reports that any current shortage of bricks is down to Covid and Brexit. The case of the West Hoathly brickworks is a total red herring and should be viewed as such by the planning committee.</p> <p>What the planning committee should also recognise is that this application is nothing to do with clay extraction and everything to do with having a hole in the ground which can be filled, with no landfill tax being paid by the applicant.</p> <p>The lip service the applicant has paid to environmental considerations is unprofessional and reports tailored to suit their own ends, do not fool the public, nor should they fool the planning committee. This application is about the greed of a few riding roughshod over the will of the many. If this application has any serious merit in it, then it may well be that despite high objections locally, there would be an acknowledgement that at least the applicant has a valid case. He does not have such a case.</p> <p>Aside from the spurious nature of the application, there are other compelling reasons to reject this out of hand. The increase in traffic on the roads and the increased danger to the public, whether motorists, cyclists, pedestrians or horse riders remains of utmost concern. It is just not credible to suppose that the huge increase in construction traffic will not have an effect. I don't think you can argue there is not going to be an increased likelihood of accidents and I'm certain there will be a death on the Loxwood Road. An independent traffic consultant has stated that the increase in traffic on our roads could be 200% more than Loxwood Clay Pits claim in the application.</p> <p>If this application does not meet the requirements of WSCC Waste and Mineral Policies, if it does not accurately demonstrate the additional level and danger of increased traffic on our roads especially the Loxwood Road and the site entrance, if it falsely claims that there is a demand for brick clay where there is none, if it is so disingenuous to not be honest that this is about landfill and greed, if it cannot demonstrate the need for additional construction recycling, if it cannot begin to demonstrate how mitigate water stress issues in woodlands, or how it will protect footpath users, then this application should be rejected out of hand and seen for what it is. Opportunistic, unnecessary, dangerous and destructive. Hardly compelling reasons to approve it.</p> <p>Please listen to the people who care, and the objections that they have all submitted.</p>
Received	09/02/2022 14:43:41
Attachments	