

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Larry Heath"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="STOVEPIPE WELLS, LOXWOOD ROAD, LOXWOOD ROAD, HORSHAM, RH12 3DW"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I wish to place an objection to this development. This development contravenes both local council and government stipulations for developments of this type, undermines land usage incentives and contravenes government stated environmental targets.</p> <p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The West Sussex Waste Plan policy W3 states that a Construction Materials Recycling Facility (CMRF), as proposed, should be on a 'Brownfield' site close to the source of the waste and close to the urban market for the recycled material. This site is neither close to a waste source nor an urban market for recycled building material, it being an undeveloped, wooded, rural location 5 miles from the closest large urban conurbation which could provide either a source of waste or a market for recycled material. It is also over 3 miles from the national Lorry Route Network (LRN) and only accessible on small country lanes.</li><li>2. The county is already well served with CMRFs there being 5 in the county already. This in conjunction with my point 3. below makes the need for this development at best weak.</li><li>3. The proposed removal of clay is not a requirement for local or national planning needs. The West Sussex Minerals Plan 2018-2033 states that in line with national policy a 25 year supply of clay is already in storage. This proposed pit is estimated to have a working life of 30 years making it unviable as a needed source of clay. The commercial clay removal argument appears to be solely a mask for the recycling operation.</li><li>4. The environmental impact of the change of use of the area is inappropriate to future government policy for the environment. The wooded nature of the area would see it's conversion to an industrial area with the concomitant increase in CO2, noise and traffic levels that are at odds with current 'green' agendas both locally and nationally.</li></ol> <p>LCP have proposed replanting and species removal on this area but the patchwork nature of the site containing ancient woodland (e.g. north west corner of the site contains category A oaks, sessile oaks etc), newer woodland, grassland, walks and bridleways etc will make this replanting and relocation insufficient to make up for the historic loss. LCP's own studies have shown 8 wintering bird species, 28 invertebrate species of national importance, abundant Slow Worms, 40 Ancient Woodland indicator species and 3 butterfly species of 'principal importance'. Any 'net biodiversity gain', as stated in the LCP proposals, would not be seen for over 30 years and would likely never be realised due to the variety of environments and the network of interdependent species long established in the area that would be lost. Whilst there may be some biodiversity gain eventually, the loss of the patchwork nature and the ancient soil and earth structures on the site plus the likelihood of complete loss of some of the species mentioned above is, I believe, too great to be seriously contemplated.</p> <p>Increases in noise levels, CO2 emissions (currently a most serious concern at COP24) and traffic (over 40+ movements of HGVs and out of the proposed site on a daily basis) just add to the likelihood of severe damage to the local area in both the long and short term.</p> <p>It is my belief that for all of the reasons above that this proposal needs to be rejected.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="15/08/2021 15:06:27"/>
Attachments	