

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="TRACEY HEDGES"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="TRELAWNE DRIVE, 31, TRELAWNE DRIVE, CRANLEIGH, GU6 8DB"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 180c states "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;" I've yet to read what the wholly exceptional circumstances for this development are. I understand there is no shortage of clay locally and there are certainly no benefits to the local community. The noise, impact of HGV traffic, pollution and environmental impact are obvious concerns. Ancient woodland is ancient woodland, replanted or not. I strongly object to the environmental report trying to downgrade ancient woodland to replanted ancient woodland to make it sound of lesser importance somehow. Yes some of it may have been replanted over time, but it has been woodland for at least 400 years and should remain so. The nature of the undisturbed woodland means it supports species that an instant woodland would not and for this reason needs the highest preservation.</p> <p>NPPF 185b says that Planning policies and decisions should "identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason." This is such an area valued greatly by so many (and not just in the immediate neighbourhood) hence it needs the upmost protection. West Sussex is becoming heavily overdeveloped, hence the ability to escape to peaceful locations and connect with nature is becoming ever more important for people's mental well-being. Because the local area is so quiet the noise pollution will be infinitely more obvious than in a built up area. We must try and protect green areas, not continually destroy them. The noise of a clay pit in this beautiful tranquil area would be as welcome as litter on a beach.</p> <p>NPPF 185c says that Planning Policies and decisions should "limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation". Dusk occurs before 6 pm from late October through to mid March. For this reason the proposal to not use artificial lighting after 6 pm is not suitable in the wintertime since it will disrupt the bats. The time at which artificial lighting is allowed should reflect the needs of protected wildlife species rather than be assigned an arbitrary value. I believe a specific bat survey should be produced by an independent agency e.g. Natural England. Certainly a bat license should be obtained before any destruction begins.</p> <p>NPPF 120a says " - such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside". There appears to be some mitigation methods in the application following destruction of habitats but no net environmental gains and reduced access to the countryside by the proposed removal of a footpath.</p> <p>This application is unnecessary and just for the financial benefit of a select few. There are detrimental effects at the local level in terms of destruction of the natural environment, safety issues surrounding HGVs and revoking peoples right to enjoy the countryside. I urge you to reject this application.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="24/08/2021 16:39:54"/>
Attachments	