Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Martin Edser
Address	GARDENERS COTTAGE, PIGBUSH LANE, PIGBUSH LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0QY
Type of Comments	Objection
	This is further to my original strong objection and prompted by the "additional" information provided by the applicant.
	I still strongly object to this application and see no justification provided by the applicant for it. There is only a selfish commercial and financial rationale for submitting it. Let's not pretend that this is an altruistic venture to satisfy some insatiable need for clay for bricks for future house building by WSCC or help the environment. The UK population is actually set to decline from 2025.
	The further information provided in my view does nothing to further the case for the application in fac it confirms very clearly what little thought and regard they have a) for the local population (or protestors as we are referred to!) that will suffer as a consequence of any such plan implemented and b) the environment and biodiversity.
	There is still no evidence for the requirement of clay or a need for extra construction recycling. The applicant has attempted to throw in some red herrings referring to the closure of West Hoathly and a comparison with Ibstock Swanage both of which are irrelevant to supporting any benefits of this application. The applicants appear to take pride that they intend to set up their own brickworks in the future - I suppose at any cost regardless of the local residents and environment if this application is an example.
	It is also telling that the applicant is critical of WSCC minerals and waste policies - why? because the policies are intended on behalf of the residents, to protect its community and environment from such inappropriate developments as those proposed. The applicant should have respect for the policies and comply.
	The applicant has not allayed my and other residents concerns for the disruption through noise, dust from the mining and crushing operation etc and from the incessant HGV's running to and form the proposed facility. The negative direct impact and secondary impacts from the quarry and waste facility has a huge footprint affecting the lives of not just those in its immediate vicinity - those 64 daily HGV's have to travel somewhere. For many this disruption would be for the rest of their lives - so I ar not convinced by the argument that 33 years is a short time to tolerate such unnecessary negative upheaval and disruption.
	This proposal can not be considered on its own, the considerable disruption, noise from other existing building projects, air craft noise from Gatwick etc need to be taken into account when considering the extra impact this proposal will have on those that live and visit here.
	Although the applicant no longer proposes to request the closure of one of the Public right of ways they have not provided any further information on how they will manage the entry and exit to the proposed site with minimal disruption and maximum safety to the users of the PROWs. As a frequent user this is of direct concern to me.
	The paper on Effects of Noise on Biodiversity concludes that this is a complex area where more study and research is required and in essence needs to be carried out site specific as it needs to assessed in the full context and almost impossibly because of the need for a control. If the applicant thought that this in some way supported their application then they have seriously misinterpreted it - it doesn't.
	In summary - I object as the application fails on many grounds - it has no benefit (other than to the applicant - where does a figure of 10m benefit to the local economy come from!) and is to the serious detriment to the local (and wider population) and environment. This is at a time when more than ever we should be working together to protect our green spaces, particularly those ancient and diverse.
Received	28/01/2022 16:45:57