

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Ken Haagman
Address	20 The Close Sutton Surrey SM3 9EQ.
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>I wish to object to the planning application for claypitt and landfill in Pallingshurst Woods. The proposed scheme is not acceptable for many reasons. I understand the proposal is for 42 HGV's to drive along Loxwood Road every day for 33 years . This would cause public safety issues for road users, cyclists, horse riders and walkers. This would cause disruption for the local communities and impact on the rural community. This type of commercial development doesn't bring any demonstrable benefits to the local community.</p> <p>I have read some documents and understand the proposal is for commercial/industrial waste to be brought into the area by HGV's , a massive industrial building will be erected in natural woodland, the waste will then be sorted and 50% will be removed out again to be sold. This is all wrong for many reasons.</p> <p>The woodland, habit and character of the area will be destroyed. This includes natural woodland that has established over many many years, some ancient woodland will be impacted and destroyed, wildlife will be destroyed and natural vegetation. I have seen deer in the woods. These will be scared away. I understand there are badgers in the area and protected bats. These will be destroyed which is unacceptable. In addition I have enjoyed the bluebells and wild orchids which are protected plants. This type of commercial building in a rural setting is unacceptable as National Policy states such development should be on brownfield and in built up areas. This area is neither of these - it is greenfield and rural.</p> <p>I am concerned the volume proposed of 42 HGV's per day will be will unsafe on the narrow rural roads. The Loxwood Road is not suitable for continuous HGV use. If this proposal goes ahead the road will soon fall into disrepair and continual cost will be required by the local council, and tax payers to maintain this. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>The applicants state they will extract clay and transport this elsewhere. I understand there is no demand for clay in West Sussex. Therefore I suspect the applicants just wish to use the area for landfill. They plan to import into the site commercial/ industrial waste, sort this and re sell 50%. The other 50% will therefore be landfill. This is not ok in a rural setting and any proposal like this will destroy the woodland permanently and have a serious visual impact . This is not sensitive to the setting and does not enhance the local area.</p> <p>The route to the proposed site along the woods is 1.3km. This currently is a local track and is not suitable for HGV use. Therefore the applicants/landowners would have to build a road. This is not acceptable through a natural woodland and will not compliment the natural environment or rural character of the area.</p> <p>The trucks will be noisy, they will create noise nuisance and pollution. This will impact of the local community and environment. Again not acceptable. There is a boarding school near to the site. Any development will cause noise, and dust pollution to the school at times the winds are in a certain direction. Also the building and machinery required will cause noise nuisance and pollution for the local villages . In stating all of this can I remind all this proposal is for 33 years - a long time.</p> <p>I am also worried if the HGV's use the current track these cross many public footpaths. These will be then be unsafe for the community to use with the continuous movement of HGV's . This poses a public safety issue and takes away an area of woodland that has been used by many for generations.. I am worried natural woodland will be destroyed and once destroyed this can never be replaced.</p> <p>A commercial building of this sort would create noise nuisance from the machines and trucks driving to it, plus the noise of generators and pollution from the diesel to run these. In addition the area will have significant light pollution. Currently there is only natural light in this area.</p> <p>I hope you will take into account my comments above and understand the reasons I am objecting very strongly to the proposal.</p>
Received	30/08/2021 17:45:13
Attachments	