

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number

Name

Address

Type of Comment

Comments

I am writing with regards to the Loxwood Claypits/Protreat application for a quarry and construction materials recycling facility (ref: WSCC/030/21), to which I would like to object. The basis of my objection centres on four main areas of concern: the demand for clay, the location's suitability, the environmental impact, and the development plan and its threat to the tranquillity of the area.

Firstly, the proposal is based upon the premise there is a demand for clay in the area. However, according to the WSCC Minerals Monitoring Report, there is no demand for additional brick-making clay, with WSCC having reserves for at least 25 years. Closures of brickworks in the area, such as West Hoathly would further illustrate this. Establishing there is no demand locally for clay would then make the second part of the applicant's proposal for a waste site insupportable. There simply is no justification for a waste site at this location, with sufficient capacity for Construction and Demolition waste in West Sussex at far more suitable locations.

But perhaps most importantly of all is the unsuitability of the location. Even if there was a demand for clay (which is questionable at best), this is a Greenfield site, which goes against National policy to use Brownfield sites. In addition, with there being no adjacent brickworks, the clay would need to be transported. This further compounds the unsuitability of the site. The driving distance from the lay-by access point to the lorry route network on the A281 is 3.25 km. This exceeds the recommended distance. What is more, the route is along unsuitable, minor roads and would pose, with the increased HGV traffic (c300%), a serious safety risk. Using these roads to get to work myself, I pass cyclists, runners, dog-walkers, pedestrians (many of whom are children) and other motorists on a daily basis. The roads are narrow (5.5 metres at their widest) with sharp corners and blind rises and can only just provide safe passage for the above mentioned users. Add HGVs into the mix and the potential for accidents is very real. The idea that two HGVs could pass with ease (as suggested by the developer's agents) is farcical, especially to anyone who uses the roads regularly (for the reasons outlined above). The infrastructure simply is not appropriate for such a scheme on grounds of safety alone.

Furthermore, there is the environmental cost to consider. This proposal comes at a time when the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has just declared 'code red for humanity'. The development of the proposed site will result in an increase in net carbon emissions from both burning fossil fuels, removing trees, disturbing the woodland floor and from additional traffic on the roads. With legislation in place to ensure the UK meets its commitment to net zero green house gas emissions this proposal not only flies in the face of the science and public feeling but endangers our ability to uphold the law and provide a safe future for generations to come. Further to this, there is also the impact upon many wildlife species (many endangered, such as the Barbastelle Bat) to consider and the contamination to the air with the increase in dust from excavation. For these reasons, it would be an unforgiveable act of vandalism on what is irreplaceably ancient woodland.

If the above was not enough, the proposal does not conform to local planning for the development of a rural area. It would bring nothing to the area, economic or otherwise, but quite the opposite. The woods are extremely popular with local residents. I believe I am the nearest resident to the proposed site and can testify to the large number of dog walkers, mountain bikers and horse riders who pass my house to access them. They do so in significant numbers throughout the year. And this proposal would have a huge impact on their enjoyment and ability to use these woods. The tranquillity of the location would be seriously compromised with the creation of pollutants and noise from machinery. Green areas such as Pallinghurst Woods play increasingly important roles in people's lives, and with rural communities growing in size with recent increases in house building, they will continue to do so and need our protection.

This proposal therefore not only sits on a spurious premise that there is a demand for clay in the area but involves a Greenfield location that is highly unsuitable for reasons outlined above. In fact, the proposal is nothing short of dangerous and irresponsible given the lasting impact it will have on our environment and the safety of its local residents and I can think of no sensible justification for it.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Received

27/08/2021 20:01:52

Attachments