Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Name Richard Keates Address POUND COTTAGE, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SQ Type of Comments Objection I note that the massive volume of objections to the establishment of a waste processing plant in Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood has caused the applicant's agents to issue an appendix to their application. This document appears to me to add very little of substance to their original application consisting of the additional submission of spurious and irrelevant data, their disagreement with expert opinion and a concern over the addresses of those who object to their plans. Surely any concerned person should have the right to express their views over applications such as this which affect our environment, regardless of their home address. The extra data have not caused me to alter my opposition to LCP's application. As a local resident, I object to the siting of an industrial facility on a greenfield site deep in unspoiled countryside. I am particularly concerned with noise and industrial poliution generated both from the recycling plant as well as the procession of heavy goods vehicles driving through / adjacent to Sussex woodland. The traffic will damage the woodland access tracks, be a danger to users of the woods and is more than the local road infrastructure can, and should be expected to, cope with. Access to the woodland has restricted visibility, the Guildford Road is too narrow for the increased volume of large vehicles and the junction on the A281 at Bucks Green is difficult to negotiate at the best of times, especially when large vehicles are at the intersection. I should also like to raise the question of how the maximum number of vehicle movements indicated in the applicat	Application number	WSCC/030/21		
Type of Objection Comments Objections to the establishment of a waste processing plant in Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood has caused the applicati's agents to issue an appendix to their application. This document appears to me to add very little of substance to their original application consisting of the additional submission of spurious and irrelevant data, their disagreement with expert opinion and a concern over the addresses of those who object to their plans. Surely any concerned person should have the right to express their views over applications such as this which affect our environment, regardless of their home address. The extra data have not caused me to alter my opposition to LCP's application. As a local resident, I object to the sing of an industrial facility on a greenfield site deep in unspoiled countryside. I am particularly concerned with noise and industrial pollution generated both from the recycling plant as well as the procession of heavy goods vehicles driving through / adjacent to Sussex woodland. The traffic will damage the woodland access tracks, be a danger to users of the woods and is more than the local road infrastructure can, and should be expected to, cope with. Access to the woodland has restricted visibility, the Guildford Road is too narrow for the increased volume of large vehicles and the junction on the A281 at Bucks Green is difficult to negotiate at the best of times, especially when large vehicles are at the intersection. I should also like to raise the question of how the maximum number of vehicle movements indicated in the application would be policed - what is to stop the operators of the waste facility / claypit exceeding the quoted traffic volumes? I also do not believe that the natural / ecological assessments truly reflect the breadth and range of the local flora and fauna and consider the planned activities will be a threat to this. I further note that the applicant now intends to open a brickworks in which to use their extracted clay. Would this be in the proximity	Name	Richard Keates		
Comment Comments I note that the massive volume of objections to the establishment of a waste processing plant in Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood has caused the applicant's agents to issue an appendix to their application. This document appears to me to add very little of substance to their original application consisting of the additional submission of spurious and irrelevant data, their disagreement with expert opinion and a concern over the addresses of those who object to their plans. Surely any concerned person should have the right to express their views over applications such as this which affect our environment, regardless of their home address. The extra data have not caused me to alter my opposition to LCP's application. As a local resident, I object to the siting of an industrial facility on a greenfield site deep in unspoiled countryside. I am particularly concerned with noise and industrial pollution generated both from the recycling plant as well as the procession of heavy goods vehicles driving through / adjacent to Sussex woodland. The traffic will damage the woodland access tracks, be a danger to users of the woods and is more than the local road infrastructure can, and should be expected to, cope with. Access to the woodland has restricted visibility, the Guildford Road is too narrow for the increased volume of large vehicles and the junction on the A281 at Bucks Green is difficult to negotiate at the best of times, especially when large vehicles are at the intersection. I should also like to raise the question of how the maximum number of vehicle movements indicated in the application would be policed - what is to stop the operators of the waste facility / claypit exceeding the quoted traffic volumes? I also do not believe that the natural / ecological assessments truly reflect the breadth and range of the local flora and fauna and consider the planned activities will be a threat to this. I further note that the applicant now intends to open a brickworks in which to use th	Address	POUND COTTAGE, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SQ		
 Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood has caused the applicant's agents to issue an appendix to their application. This document appears to me to add very little of substance to their original application consisting of the additional submission of spurious and irrelevant data, their disagreement with expert opinion and a concern over the addresses of those who object to their plans. Surely any concerned person should have the right to express their views over applications such as this which affect our environment, regardless of their home address. The extra data have not caused me to alter my opposition to LCP's application. As a local resident, I object to the siting of an industrial facility on a greenfield site deep in unspoiled countryside. I am particularly concerned with noise and industrial pollution generated both from the recycling plant as well as the procession of heavy goods vehicles driving through / adjacent to Sussex woodland. The traffic will damage the woodland access tracks, be a danger to users of the woods and is more than the local road infrastructure can, and should be expected to, cope with. Access to the woodland has restricted visibility, the Guildford Road is too narrow for the increased volume of large vehicles and the junction on the A281 at Bucks Green is difficult to negotiate at the best of times, especially when large vehicles are at the intersection. I should also like to raise the question of how the maximum number of vehicle movements indicated in the application would be policed - what is to stop the operators of the waste facility / claypit exceeding the quoted traffic volumes? I also do not believe that the natural / ecological assessments truly reflect the breadth and range of the local flora and fauna and consider the planned activities will be a threat to this. I further note that the applicant now intends to open a brickworks in which to use their extracted clay. Would this be in the proximity of the extraction site?		Objection		
		Pallinghurst Woods, Loxw application. This document appears to the additional submission a concern over the addre have the right to express regardless of their home The extra data have not of As a local resident, I obje countryside. I am particul recycling plant as well as woodland. The traffic will damage the than the local road infras has restricted visibility, the and the junction on the A when large vehicles are at maximum number of vehicles are at maximum number of vehicles are at the local flora and fauna I further note that the ap Would this be in the proximication Which claims the brickwo demand from this yet-to- Please record my strong	wood has caused the applicant's agents to issue an appendix to their or me to add very little of substance to their original application consisting of of spurious and irrelevant data, their disagreement with expert opinion and sees of those who object to their plans. Surely any concerned person should their views over applications such as this which affect our environment, address. caused me to alter my opposition to LCP's application. ect to the siting of an industrial facility on a greenfield site deep in unspoiled larly concerned with noise and industrial pollution generated both from the the procession of heavy goods vehicles driving through / adjacent to Sussex we woodland access tracks, be a danger to users of the woods and is more tructure can, and should be expected to, cope with. Access to the woodland he Guildford Road is too narrow for the increased volume of large vehicles the intersection. I should also like to raise the question of how the icle movements indicated in the application would be policed - what is to stop the facility / claypit exceeding the quoted traffic volumes? the natural / ecological assessments truly reflect the breadth and range of and consider the planned activities will be a threat to this. pplicant now intends to open a brickworks in which to use their extracted clay. imity of the extraction site? Can we expect another application in the future rks is essential to the claypit's operations? What is the guarantee that the be sanctioned facility will materialise?	

Attachments