Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Roger Nash
Address	WEYHURST COPSE, TISMANS COMMON, TISMANS COMMON, HORSHAM, RH12 3BJ
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	I am chairman of Rudgwick Preservation Society, which has submitted a response by email in my name. However, this is a personal objection from me, a relatively near neighbour of the site. I lived in Loxwood for the first 20 or so years of my life, and have lived in Rudgwick since 1993. I have used these woods recreationally in both phases of my life. I have a degree in geography, and feel I can comment semi-professionally on planning matters such as this. I have recently read the letter of "significant objection" by Bell Cornwall, Chartered Town Planners, dated 26 August 2021. I wish to state that I agree with every single word of this letter. It is significant that both the Stop The Clay Pit group who commissioned this letter, and Rudgwick's Preservation Society have similar views, and have frequently worked together in this campaign of opposition. it is evident from the planning portal that a great many individuals and households agree with us, even though plenty of objections, including that of my society and Bell Cornwall, are not yet uploaded. The adjacent communities are presenting a united front. Of course, we care deeply about issues relating to transport in Tisman's Common and Bucks Green, but we also care for our environment, heritage, and recreational use of the woodland PROWs (including our mental health). We are fully aware of the absurdity of locating a business recycling waste in such a sensitive environment, the even greater absurdity of digging a hole only to have to fill it in again, transporting both waste and clay unknown distances despite their being sufficient sites and capacity in West Sussex already. A further significant objection is the premise that the area will only see a net gain in biodiversity in well over the 30 year life of the site. The net loss in the intervening 30+ years is acceptable to the applicant, but is not acceptable for the organisms, large and small, which currently live there, and are now threatened. If the applicant cares about biodiversity so much, they should spend the next 30 years enhancing further the woods they have already owned for several decades. Their record so far has been quite good, particularly replacing conifer plantations with hardwoods. Why throw out the baby with the bathwater?
Received	30/08/2021 17:32:21
Attachments	