

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Neeteesha Newell
Address	WOODSIDE, GUILDFORD ROAD, GUILDFORD ROAD, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SF
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>I wish to formally object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The proposed operation does not conform with either the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan, or the Chichester District Local Plan for development in a rural area. This application is not sensitive to its setting in terms of size, bulk or location. It does not enhance, protect or compliment the natural environment or rural character of the area.</li><li>2. The proposed operation does not bring any demonstrable benefits to the local community, in fact, quite the opposite. In the seven and half years since living here, my family and I have enjoyed near daily walks/cycles within this woodland. Over the last 18 months, this has provided a much need haven for us all and the surrounding community.</li><li>3. The impact this development would have on the environment and wildlife would be detrimental. The tranquil and peaceful surroundings enjoyed by all will replaced by highly intrusive noise from tracked vehicles and excavators.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Mature trees on the development site have been identified as having potential roost features for bats, some of these will be amongst the first to be felled.</li><li>b. Amongst the bats identified on the site I am aware of four threatened (priority species). For example, the Barbastelle Bat is rare in Sussex and is an International European Protected Species.</li><li>c. The increased HGV traffic poses significant impact on local villages, road users and pedestrians.</li><li>d. The application also includes a 15,000 sq ft building amongst pristine woodlands. The ancillary building and quarrying operation would have a significant visual impact in the landscape. There are no other buildings within the woodland</li></ol></li><li>4. Furthermore, the proposed location is a greenfield site. National policy states that waste sites should be sited in built-up areas or brownfield sites; which this proposal seems to be in direct contradiction of.</li><li>5. Demand for clay also appears to not support this proposal with a trend towards consolidation in local brick making, rather than new brickworks opening.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Furthermore, the latest WSCC Minerals Monitoring Report references no additional demands for brickmaking clay as reserves are in surplus of 25 years.</li><li>b. There are three sites with 25 years supply of clay and one with 24 years, therefore the national and local level clay requirements are met.</li><li>c. The applicant's argument for clay demand is further superseded by the closure of West Hoathly brickworks.</li><li>d. Clay extraction is typically adjacent to brick making factories. It is uneconomic and environmentally unsound to transport clay over any distance.</li></ol></li></ol> <p>Based on the arguments presented above, I would strongly urge the refusal of this application. The damage this would have on a pristine woodland and community for several generations would be irrefutable.</p>
Received	30/08/2021 20:32:19
Attachments	