

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Pippa Carte"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="MALLARDS FARM, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0QW"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	

Road safety

I believe the applicant is underestimating the number of vehicle movements and the impact on Loxwood Road and the A281 junction and also in accessing the woodland. Visibility at the site entrance is minimal and the applicant is relying on a minimum figure - this does not seem a sensible approach when considering HGV vehicles. There is a very real risk of a cars travelling west towards Loxwood colliding into the rear of an HGV waiting to enter the LCP site at the lay-by entrance. These are rural roads used by cars, horses and walkers and are unsuitable for heavy HGV traffic.

Demand for Clay

The applicant has presented no further evidence of the need for additional construction materials recycling in West Sussex and contravenes WSCC Minerals Policy M5. The applicant has argued the clay on site is suitable for brick making so WSCC can only consider extraction for that purpose. There is no evidence presented of a local demand for clay nor any potential customers named. The proposal to create a new small brickworks (which should be subject to a separate planning process) is proposed. This seems contrary to the lack of demand for clay and the trend towards consolidation of brickmaking companies.

Safe use of the forest and public rights of way

The developers propose that they will not now close the footpath on the northern boundary. PROW 792-1. With young children, animals and adult walkers using this public right of way how will safety be secured with nearby deep pits and both walkers and HGV on the same track? The proposed barrier at bridleway 3240 will only be on one side but HGV traffic travels in both directions and a risk to public safety remains. This is without considering the negative impacts of noise, dust, loss of peace and tranquility and the mental health benefits of enjoying walks in the woodland.

Species loss

The new Bat Survey only covers a few specific trees in the direct development site and does not cover the wider woodland area which will be affected and disrupted by the development. The survey examined the trees, some of which it is planned to fell, for roosting bats but fails to take into account the bats use of the woods travelling to forage. The Bat Survey refers to Horsham District wildlife and biodiversity policies but the site is in Chichester district. The applicant does not mention the Duty conferred on the Chichester District (NERC 2006) to have regard to biodiversity, and, does mention the status/legal position of the European Protected Species as updated since leaving the European Union, eg. Barbastelle Bat.

Finally, I would also like to raise an objection to the developer seeking to identify the location of the objectors and propose only those in the local area have a right to object. I believe the residential address of any objector has no bearing on the merits of the objection and risks a breach of data protection and infringement of privacy.

Received

Attachments