

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Doug Betts"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="SUMMERFOLD, 8, SUMMERFOLD, RUDGWICK, HORSHAM, RH12 3BY"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I object most strongly to this totally inappropriate application to create a clay pit and Construction Materials Recycling Facility. It fails on all accounts to meet the accepted criteria for such developments. First, we do not need the clay. West Sussex has a 25 year supply. So where is the clay required? Not in West Sussex, so clearly somewhere else, a location not identified. Yet the clay and its use in a brickworks should be close together (as defined by the West Sussex Minerals Policy) or the transport of the clay should take place close to the Lorry Route Network; in this case (Strategic LRN) that is the A24, 9 miles away; even the Local LRN, the A281, is 3 miles away. What part of our precious countryside are LCP proposing to devote to a new brickworks?</p> <p>We have sufficient (5) CMRF sites in West Sussex already, properly located close to built-up areas and the source of materials (inert waste dug for the foundations of new buildings). So, we have the prospect of a large hole being dug to extract clay that is not required locally and refilled with materials far from the source of construction and demolition waste. It is not too difficult to discern that the CMRF is the chief reason for this application to fulfil contracts for the disposal of such waste from afar, including London. The transport of materials over large distances to a remote location in the countryside cannot, surely, be acceptable and the West Sussex Waste Plan confirms this.</p> <p>Not only is the proposed location of the CMRF remote from the source of materials, it is in quite the wrong kind of location as it should (WS Waste Plan Policy) be in an existing quarry or pit and on a brownfield site not on the greenfield site proposed, as well as close to the urban market for materials. Surely it would be stretching this definition to the limit to create the hole first and then claim it is an existing pit on a brownfield site?</p> <p>The impact of such a development on an ecologically sensitive environment would be immense, including noise, dust, emissions, movement of heavy HGVs, habitat disturbance, visual intrusion and impact on Ancient Woodland. This is a biodiverse environment, a mosaic of mixed woodlands, at different stages of maturity, openness and species mix. As far as the actual areas proposed to be taken up by the clay pit, CMRF and waste processing plant are concerned, we are to be asked to wait for over 30 years for restitution, following loss of mature trees, permanent disturbance of a wide variety of wildlife and release of CO2 into the environment. Restitution way into the future cannot compensate for the loss now at a time when we should and must protect our countryside.</p> <p>These woods are a much loved leisure location for the residents of the surrounding parishes, including Loxwood, Rudgwick and Alfold, who use the numerous Public Rights of Way for walking, cycling and horse riding. The great benefit of such locations is their remoteness, wildness and especially tranquillity. COVID has been instrumental in highlighting such benefits for public well-being and mental health. This environment is about to be destroyed if this plan goes ahead, for the tranquillity, remoteness and wildness will be lost with the incursion of a heavy industrial activity.</p> <p>Last, but not in any sense least, to allow the use of a narrow country road by a large number of daily HGV vehicles is surely unacceptable on all counts. However theoretical the ability of the road to take such a volume and type of use, both the perception and the actuality of the loss of safety will be experienced by all other road users, vehicular, pedestrian, cycle mounted, and horse mounted. This is apart from the nuisance for years to come for the residents along and adjacent to what was a quiet minor road. All these HGV vehicles will turn from and to the A281 at Bucks Green, already an extremely busy through route.</p> <p>I wish to make clear that this proposal is not 'just' an issue for Loxwood in which the development is to take place but also for Rudgwick, not only in terms of the traffic passing through it along the Loxwood Road and A281, but also because this is part of our much loved environment, an environment to be protected from predatory attacks from landowners who have no cultural investment in the community but are interested only in what can be extracted from it.</p> <p>I trust that you will reject this application.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="10/08/2021 20:36:30"/>
Attachments	