

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="D Brimblecombe"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="ROBINS POST, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SS"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p><b>OBJECTION</b></p> <p>I strongly oppose this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Demand for clay.</p> <p>Active brickworks in West Sussex have adequate supplies of clay according to WSCC's latest mineral report.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to extract clay from the site but who they will sell it to? The applicant refers to the brickworks at West Hoathly as a potential buyer, but this site closed months ago.</p> <p>Ibstock (the operators) advise "We have other operating sites in West and East Sussex, plus one in Surrey. None of these sites require further off-site supply of clay and all have reserves adjacent at the current time."</p> <p>If there was a demand for clay, it would have to be transported away from the site by HGV resulting in a significant increase in HGV movements, which is neither economic nor environmentally desirable. In any event the site is not "well related" to the LRN (Lorry Route Network) and Loxwood Road is too narrow and inherently unsuitable to accommodate the extra lorry traffic that would be generated. There is no justification for the clay extraction and therefore the proposed waste operation is not required either. Even if it was, the site is not in a suitable location.</p> <p><b>Waste Operation</b></p> <p>WSCC already has sufficient waste recycling capability in other locations which are actually suitable. This is a greenfield site which is unsuitable. The applicant's proposal does not comply with the Local Waste Plan.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant does not clearly identify the origin or nature of the waste to be processed which should be of concern to WSCC.</p> <p>In any event, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the local environment.</p> <p>The applicant's proposes a waste recycling building of c15,000 sq ft building and further ancillary building of c1500 sq ft. These buildings would have a significant and negative visual impact on the character of the area. Diesel generators would have to be used to power the site unless and until an overhead electricity supply is established.</p> <p>This is a very quiet and tranquil area. The proposed development would create noise, light and other pollution.</p> <p><b>Highways Concerns</b></p> <p>In my view, the vehicle movement information provided by the applicant is significantly underestimated.</p> <p>The significant increase in HGV traffic volumes would result in a severe environmental and safety issue for all other road users including motorists, walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Loxwood Road is simply too narrow for the types and volumes of HGV's that would result from the proposal.</p> <p><b>Environmental Concerns</b></p> <p>This tranquil woodland site is rich in biodiversity.</p> <p>The applicant's proposal would result in a large number of trees and other vegetation being removed resulting in a significant loss of habitat.</p> <p>The information submitted by the applicant in one of their many reports is alarming.</p> <p>Their Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment comments:</p> <p>"Overall this assessment has shown that the majority of baseline area habits will be lost.."</p> <p>It goes on to say:</p> <p>"Areas of new habitats will be created as part of Site restoration resulting in a net loss of -36.59% in area habitats".</p> <p>In my view, the provision of a fishing lake (on private land) in 33 years' time does not compensate for the loss of habitat proposed by the development.</p> <p>Given that there is no demonstrable public benefit to this development that would outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the site environment, the application should be refused.</p> <p><b>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</b></p> <p>The proposed access track runs close to number of established rights of way which would create an</p>

obvious safety issue/conflict if members of the public are walking close to HGV's using the track to access the site.

The applicant proposes the temporary closure (for 33 years) of an existing public footpath with a significant diversion.

I understand that 2 separate DMMO applications submitted to WSCC are currently outstanding.

Given that planning decisions should "protect and enhance public rights of way and access", the application should be refused.

Received

16/08/2021 09:21:23

Attachments