Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application
number
Name
Address

WSCC/030/21

Emma Bell

CORAL HOUSE, POND CLOSE, POND CLOSE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SH

Type of Comment Comments Objection

On the ninth of August this year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released its 2021 report on the progression of climate change and revealed to the public that the global temperature rise that has been observed over the past century is now irreversible. The effects this will have on people worldwide will be detrimental and "It is unequivocal that human influence has warmed the atmosphere, ocean and land." - as said by the IPCC themselves. Now more than ever it is imperative that each individual takes responsibility for the planet we all share together. So why is it at all acceptable for 300 acres of the undisturbed Pallinghurst forest to be converted into a waste pit?

Naturally human demands must be allowed for when considering reducing our impact on the environment. However, according to the latest WSCC Minerals Monitoring Report, there is currently 25 years worth of bricklaying clay in reserve. This complete lack of demand for clay, and therefore a new clay pit, is emphasised by the closing of the West Hoathly brickworks. A number of actual human demands currently lie on this area of woodland that would be utterly destroyed if Loxwood Clay Pit Ltd were to go ahead with their plans. This is currently a region with high water stress, so people rely on the forest to mitigate the effects of drought. A green space is vital to our mental health, often people rely on the forest to find that tranquility and Pallinghurst woods is no different with a very low level of light and noise pollution - these desirable features will be eliminated. Furthermore, whilst it seems like a small place, the entirety of Earth's population relies on every bit of woodland on this planet to reduce atmospheric carbon levels and what is planned for this area between the trucks, mining machinery and other uses of electricity will increase net carbon emissions which can only be described as irresponsible in the current climate.

Any argument that could be made for the positive environmental effects of a new recycling site, as is planned for the area, are made almost completely null by the fact that the site that will be erected in Pallinghurst woods will only recycle 50% of the waste brought to it - an amount that doesn't reach the industry standard.

The unsuitability of this location for a clay pit and waste site is further exaggerated by its geographical location. The 42 daily HGV movements will take place down small, minor roads due to this area being a greenfield site, posing both a threat to other road users and pedestrians. National policy says that waste sites should be built in built-up areas or brownfield sites which makes more sense, considering that these areas would be more accessible, unlike Pallinghurst woods in which there would be a 4.55 km driving distance for HGVs from the site to the Lorry Route network which exceeds the limit advised. This distance is actually larger than the distance of the proposed site from the Rikkyo School which boards a large number of school-aged children that, due to prevailing Southwesterly winds and only being 1 km from the development area will be put in danger of long-term health effects from the amount of dust and pollutants that will be carried right into their playground.

The impact of these plans, however, must also be considered from beyond the human perspective. The lay-by parking area where the wheel wash will be housed is currently home to an active badger sett and the 300 acres of woodland itself is also known to be an occupied habitat for four endangered bat species, including the Barbastelle Bat. Deer are also regularly sighted in the woods by pedestrians that use the walking routes.

Here are a number of reasons for why Loxwood Clay Pits Ltd's plans for a waste disposal and clay pit site for the 300 acres of woodland owned in Pallinghurst woods should not be allowed to proceed. These reasons are poorly counter-argued by the excuses that have been placed forward about the necessity of the site, a necessity that has all but been disproven and in considering this objection it is hoped that the reader understands that continuing with the scheme laid out for this area has so many negative effects for both the local and global community that this whole idea, from the perspective of those who are not benefitting monetarily, can only be seen as unethical.

Received

30/08/2021 19:43:35

Attachments