Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number Name

WSCC/030/21

John Crisp

CRABTREE COTTAGE, DRUNGEWICK LANE, DRUNGEWICK LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 ORP

Objection

Type of Comment Comments

Address

I would like to reconfirm my previous objection to the application following the submission of additional documents by the applicant for the following reasons:

1) Nothing in the additional documents submitted provide any argument that the application complies with the following policies:

WSCC Minerals plan policies M5 (a) (i) and (ii), M5 (5) (iii), M20 (c) (i), (ii) and (iii), M17 (c), M18.

-Claims by the applicant regarding the demand for clay and it's uses is unsubstantiated. There is no evidence of a shortfall of clay in Surrey, Pitsham Brickworks uses a different type of clay and new potential customers of clay are not specified

WSCC Waste Policies W1 (c), W3 (b) (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv), W4 (a) and (b). W (10) (a), W12 (a) and (b) (i), (ii), (iii), and (v)

-No new justification provided for additional construction material recycling in West Sussex.

Chichester Local Plan policy 25 - Development of the North of the Plan Area

Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12 - The Rural Area

- 2) Transport the applicant seems to have seriously understated the number of proposed vehicles movements (42 a day) proposed for the work that will be carried out and this will have a huge impact on the locally area and the dangers caused by HGV's driving along a narrow country road, particularly as the Highway Code now requires a gap of 1.5m when passing cyclists and horses. The poor visibility at the site entrance will result in the potential of a very serious accident for vehicles travelling towards Loxwood as the entrance to the site is located on a tight unsighted curve in the road on downward slope of a hill.
- 3) The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) does not take into account a number of species of wildlife and has not addressed the issue of water stress which the Natural England report identified. The bat survey is inadequate as it only covers a small area of the overall woodland. There are live badger sets very close to the Lane the vehicles will use
- 4) PROW's. The applicant has not adequately thought through or offered solutions to the clear safety issues raised by HGV's crossing PROW'S and bridleways which are regularly used by pedestrians, dogs and horses

I would like to make one last point, I note that the applicant has tried to find out the location of the objectors as he believes an objection should not count if you reside outside the consultation area. Apart from the questionable tactics which I assume breach the data protection act, I fail to see what relevance where someone lives should have on their right to object to the application. For the record, the applicant is based in Esher and his consultant is based in Newport.

Received

26/01/2022 13:21:22

Attachments