

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Jeremy Curling
Address	WYKINFOLD, TISMANS COMMON, TISMANS COMMON, HORSHAM, RH12 3BJ
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	

I am writing to object in the strongest terms possible to the proposed waste recycling and incidental clay extraction pit planning application by Loxwood Clay Pits.

There are so many grounds on which to reject this application. There is the excellent work carried out to demonstrate that there is no requirement for additional clay for brick making. There is the well researched work into the environmental destruction the this business would cause. There is the clear evidence of the havoc and danger this would cause on the local roads. There is the real life anecdotal evidence, that can't be supported by studies or consultants on the damaging effect this proposal will have on the local community. These are the intangibles that Protreat's henchman and LCP can't rebut with their versions of "facts", figures, graphs, drawings or their laughable community engagement on the webinars where Hobson's choice was the only choice.

So here are the tangible reasons to refuse this.

Demand for clay is being met in the area with more than enough clay reserves to serve the brick making industry for 25 years or more. In clay pit terms this is a tiny scheme and it is difficult to see how this could in any way be a viable operation, especially when you factor in that there is no brick making facility nearby. Until you consider where the money IS to be made. Because this of course is a money making scheme. We all know that any serious money made under this planning application is from the landfill and recycling operation that is to follow any clay excavation. Making money is fair enough. It's a business. But at any cost?

Waste Recycling, sounds terrific, but ultimately this is landfill with with a mere 50% of the material brought in to the site being recycled. That is a lot of electricity, diesel and water being used.

I have worked in farming, construction and forestry all my adult life and I have never seen a landfill in the middle of a woodland. This is a WOODLAND, not a brownfield site, where national planning policy states that waste sites should be located. Is a woodland, which even if, as Protreat claim, is not ancient on the proposed pit area, but has much ancient woodland surrounding it really suitable place to construct a 15000sq ft building and then haul in building waste on a fleet of trucks?

Thus in terms of the Local Development Plans there is no way this application can be said to conform. Does it enhance, protect or compliment the natural environment, now or 33 years in the future? One fishing pond hardly serves to offset the 33 years of preceding damage.

If as planners you are minded to accept everything Protreat and LCP says in favour of this scheme, then maybe you are forgetting that this application, if successful, will have a substantial NEGATIVE effect on the local community. The strength of feeling surrounding this scheme is undeniable. Your decisions will have an effect on the local and wider community for generations. Can you afford to generate such long term ill will?

So if you accept that LCP have made the case for clay extraction and waste recycling, are you prepared to accept that this scheme will flood the roads with HGVs for 33 years? I have worked in and alongside the construction industry most of my adult life. There is NO WAY that LCP can control the flow and movement, the direction or speed of HGVs on the roads approaching this site. I know truck drivers. They are tasked to get from A to B as quickly as possible and that is what they will do. You can't blame them. But the consequences of this are obvious for all to see. Aside from the environmental impact the increase in trucks will have, the road safety aspect of this scheme is truly frightening. The approach roads were not built for and are not suitable for trucks of this size and number. This scheme effectively makes the surrounding roads a haul road for a landfill. I've seen a lot of haul roads in my time and they all have certain things in common. They are noisy, dangerous, dusty, littered with rubbish (dust sheets or not) and in constant need of repair. These local Sussex roads built over Sussex clay cannot handle the constant movement over them of HGVs without the the sub base heaving and distorting. The roads will break up at the verges and potholes will appear. They are awful already. Drivers avoid potholes and on the already NARROW roads this will make the the likelihood of collision even greater. Then you consider the fact that these are rural roads. Rural roads carry not just cars and trucks, but cyclists, pedestrians and horses and that is how it should be and should remain. Your decision could be responsible for driving these legitimate users off the highway in the pursuit of one companies profit. And the reason people will be driven off these roads will be because at some point there will be a death on these rural roads. A totally preventable death. Protreat state the roads are wide enough. They are not. Real world on site observation will tell you that in 5 minutes. Come to this road network during silaging time when for two weeks three times a year a fleet of tractors and trailers are on the move and you will have a microcosm of what the the next 33 years will be like. And unlike the HGVs, the tractor drivers are locals, who know the roads and pinch points and drive accordingly. Safely. Considerately. Follow an HGV, or better still, meet an

oncoming HGV and see how you feel about how safe these roads are. It will scare you. This scheme should be rejected on the traffic danger alone.  
Then the intangibles. Mental wellbeing. Access to nature, tranquility, peace (it's why we live here). All vitally important. Destroyed by the constant unremitting screech of a truck's reversing warning horn for 33 years (that sound travels a long long way), all in the pursuit of one thing. Profit. For a scheme neither wanted or NEEDED. And at what cost? A death on the road?

Received

24/08/2021 08:45:59

Attachments