

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Peter Nataraj"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="STATION ROAD, 5, STATION ROAD, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SN"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>As a daily user of the woodlands and footpaths directly being affected by the proposed development I strongly object to the application which will irreparably damage this greenfield site. This peaceful rural area will be disrupted with light, noise and particulate pollution where currently there is none. During a global push to improve the environment this is clearly a retrograde and avoidable step.</p> <p>Children using safe footpaths as they have for decades will be competing with commercial vehicles on crossing tracks.</p> <p>There is no local commercial necessity for clay so no need to denude the woodland. By implication there is therefore no need to have a "hole" to fill. If a waste processing plant is deemed necessary there is no valid reason to build it on a greenfield site when brownfield sites are locally available. The proposal states an assumed gain to the local economy but in no way accepts the costs to the community.</p> <p>I object to the general principle of the application as stated above but have specific issue with the traffic plan.</p> <p>The intent of using a "crow flow" direct routing to the A281 to remain in the expected distance from the LRN while also arguing that the traffic generated will not follow that direct route but drive along existing, unsuitable roads at over double the "permitted" shows the proposers intent to attempt to find loopholes in a system intended to protect our environment.</p> <p>The impact of an increase in HGV traffic by over 200% on roads not designed for that frequency of movements does not seem to have been costed. A glimpse at the damage caused to Wildwood Lane by HGV traffic during a comparatively short build outside Cranleigh can give some insight into the damage we can expect on our local roads. Who will pay for the increased repair and upkeep of the roads over the next 33 years?</p> <p>If there is an increased frequency of repair it will by default imply an increase in frequency of road closures. This will force traffic through Loxwood with increasing regularity. Who will police the correct movement of traffic and what are the implications of not adhering to a proposed traffic plan?</p> <p>As a regular cyclist on the proposed route it fills me with dread to have high frequency of HGV's on roads already too narrow. The measured road widths do not take any account of the effective rarer than actual width of the carriageways. The damage already visible to the road edges means the usable width is below that measured through out most of the length of the route.</p> <p>The proposed entrance to the site is at a corner that is challenging to see around well and has considerable high speed traffic sharing the road with cyclists, pedestrians and equestrian road users. The average speed of vehicles negotiating the corner in a survey conducted during COVID should not be used as the basis for calculating expected stopping distances. Accidents are not caused by the average speed traffic but the maximum speed vehicles that round the bend. Any visibility/stopping distance calculations that rely on the lower speeds do not accurately represent the probability of the most dangerous outcome, a static HGV crossing both lanes on a corner with poor sight lines.</p> <p>The proposal has multiple negative impacts for the local community lasting generations, with no wider positive benefits outside a small number of people who may work on site and should not be approved.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="25/08/2021 21:41:12"/>
Attachments	