Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application
number
Name

WSCC/030/21

Brian Allen

Address

WOODFIELD ROAD, 22, WOODFIELD ROAD, HORSHAM, RH12 3EP

Type of Comment Comments

Objection

I object to the proposed application ref: WSCC/030/21

I have lived in Rudgwick for 9 years and Pallinghurst woods are a place I have visited regularly. It is currently a beautiful, tranquil place where I enjoy walking with my dog. It would be a great shame if this were to change.

The proposal is, in my opinion, a cynical attempt to hide a facility where it was hoped that the local people would not complain. The initial reason given for this 'resource' exploitation was the feeble excuse of "providing much needed clay for the manufacture of bricks". This nugget was then augmented by news that building waste would be brought in for recycling. The recycled waste would then be sent off with the remainder used for backfilling the hole created by the extraction of the clay. As I understand it, there is no great need for excavation of more clay to make bricks as has been claimed. On top of this, brick-works are closing down surely showing a decrease in demand, not an increase.

The recycling plant (in my mind the real reason for this proposal) is not required either as sufficient facilities already exist - and in more suitable locations. The transportation of extracted clay plus the waste both incoming (and outgoing again if recycled) is bad news. The lorries will have to travel along country lanes which are used not only by cars, but cyclists and riders on horses. Even on the Pallinghurst estate itself, the route the lorries would take is crossed by Public Rights of Way and therefore causes safety concerns to the public. It is even proposed to 'temporarily' close a Public Right of Way, probably for the duration of the project. And we can say goodbye to tranquility I do not see any true benefit to the locality or the local population - just a lot of noise coming from a large building in the woods with a steady stream of lorries coming and going down roads that were not designed for them. Add the fact that it is scheduled to last over 30 years and it is all too much. Please deny this proposal!

Received

11/08/2021 17:40:38

Attachments