

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Robert Hymas"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="MANANA, CHURCH STREET, CHURCH STREET, HORSHAM, RH12 3ET"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

The planning application WSCC/030/21 concerns me for a number of reasons and because of these I object to the application.

The increase in HGV traffic on country roads and a difficult junction to join the already very busy A281 at Bucks Green is clearly not desirable. The road between Loxwood and Bucks Green is narrow and has many corners. There is a good direct comparison with the the relatively short term restoration work at Rudgwick brickworks. The increased volume of HGVs over the past few years has been very noticeable and although there was a high level of consideration by the drivers when they were on Lynwick Street, walking in the area was disturbed by the noise and the sight of HGVs and it did make walks more difficult, even if the walk only involved crossing Lynwick Street. One can also not help but notice the significant damage to the road surface caused by the heavy vehicles. This would obviously occur on Loxwood Road.

The negative impact of the increased traffic on the already close to capacity A281 was also very apparent. With further planned housing development in the area, I do not believe any further proposals which will add to the traffic on the A281 should proceed.

The proposal is also for an area that has fantastic country walks that provide peace and quiet and beauty. The additional noise and undoubted impact on beauty cannot be dismissed as other developments in both Surrey and West Sussex makes such important features increasingly rare. Their loss would be a detriment to the enjoyment of local residents and visitors to the area.

I also believe there are economic issues. Firstly, the potential to re-use some of the brownfield sites which exist should be considered before a greenfield site is developed. Secondly, as I implied above, other clay and brickworks are closing. Whilst an argument can be presented that increased house building increases demand for clay and bricks, this increase is, I believe, from a period of reduced demand for such products. It must also be recognised that building methods are different to the past and the requirement for bricks is, I understand, lower due to the use of blocks and timber frames. This change is identified in the application and as a mitigation there is reference in the application to the suitability of the clay for cement which is then used in concrete blocks. It is, however, unclear if any necessary process for this use will be undertaken at this site or elsewhere.

If, as set out in the preceding paragraph, demand is either not as expected or can be met from existing sites, there must, in my view, be commercial risks if this development was permitted of it becoming an underused eye-sore and, without the continuation of investment to maintain the proposed standards, it operating in an undesirable manner. There is also a potential requirement for a further application for additional processes to be undertaken which may result in further adverse local impact from noise and odour. My concern is, therefore, that as a result of the commercial risks, the site will either not receive the necessary level of investment and so not meet the required standards or will expand into a bigger enterprise that has a more substantial negative impact. This clear risk is another reason for my objection to the application.

My final concern, which I believe under the parameters you have to consider is probably ancillary, is about the resources available to the applicant. I do, however, think that it is pertinent and consideration given as to how it is ensured that, if the proposal is given consent, it operates as expected.

Specifically, the documents accompanying the application show a considerable amount of expertise to provide technical input, but are there any assurances that this expertise will be involved in the on-going operation of the site? The applicant is also a relatively newly formed company (incorporated in April 2017) with minimal assets shown in the latest accounts available at Companies House. Indeed, the three years' of accounts filed with Companies House are all for a dormant company.

Whilst I acknowledge that the application was submitted after the date of the most recent accounts filed at Companies House, for the reasons I have given, I believe there should be a clear understanding of how the operation (if approved) set out in the application is being financed and how standards will be maintained.

I also note that the owners have other business interests, but none of these appear to involve clay extraction or have a business model as set out in the application. To me, these points raise the question of whether the applicant has access on a long term basis to the necessary financial and technical resources for a project which requires a high level of sympathy to its location. I trust these are questions to which you have answers in considering the application.

Received

23/08/2021 12:54:33

Attachments