

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Application number | <input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>  |
| Name               | <input type="text" value="Andrew Bridger"/>   |
| Address            | <input type="text" value="PEMBERLEY, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SQ"/>   |
| Type of Comment    | <input type="text" value="Objection"/>  |
| Comments           | <p>Myself and family are longstanding residents of Loxwood and object in the strongest possible terms this clay pit and landfill site proposal. My objections are numerous but can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The proposed site is an undisputable greenfield site. National Government policy clearly states that waste sites should be built on built up or brownfield sites. The proposed site in Loxwood is neither.</li><li>2) The proposed development plan does not conform to either the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan or Chichester District Local Plan</li><li>3) The plan is not in keeping with the existing local setting, does not improve or enhance the local environment or provide any discernible benefit (financially or developmentally) to the local area.</li><li>4) The (declared) increase in heavy traffic cannot be supported by the already frail local road network. The minor roads and lanes are wholly inadequate to cope with the size and volume of traffic proposed. It is also highly likely that the declared traffic volumes will be higher in reality.</li><li>5) The increased traffic volume will represent a severe health and safety risk to the surrounding communities both in terms of road safety and pollution.</li><li>6) The resultant loss of flora and fauna and natural animal habitat would be grave. This includes active badger sets and multiple longstanding habitats for local wildlife. c16,000 trees are proposed to be destroyed. Re-planting is not mitigation for this damage.</li><li>7) There is no evidence or justification whatsoever that additional clay is required for bricks and building materials locally. West Sussex County Council has publicly declared that it has 25 years of reserves. There are existing clay brickworks local to the area, all with generous reserves. Indeed, a clay brickworks at West Hoathley has recently been closed due to lack of demand and commercial viability. Combined these facts prove there is no requirement for additional demand.</li><li>8) There is no requirement for additional waste recycling in the area. WSCC has already declared that it does not need additional capacity.</li><li>9) Planning policy requires waste sites to be built on brownfield or built up areas. Loxwood is neither.</li><li>10) The whole development would represent multiple losses of local amenities and tranquility. Pollution via odour, emissions, light, sound and line of site will be extreme and in complete contrast to existing conditions.</li><li>11) The development would mean loss of public rights of way and access to countryside accessible for hundreds of years. The plan cites closure as "temporary". 33 years is not temporary.</li></ol> <p>Overall, there is simply no justification for this development other than corporate greed and commercial gain. There is no requirement for either clay or waste recycling in the local or surrounding areas (indeed it would put pressure on existing, established commercial ventures), but, moreover, even if there was a requirement, the proposed development site is wholly inappropriate, destroying ancient woodland on a greenfield site. I object in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>Regards,<br/>Andrew Bridger, Loxwood Resident</p> |
| Received           | <input type="text" value="28/08/2021 10:10:36"/>  |
| Attachments        |   |