From: [redacted]
To: PL Planning Applications
Subject: WSCC/030/21
Date: 29 January 2022 21:25:47

Sheepfields
Forest Green
Dorking
Surrey
RH5 5PR

29th January 2022

County Planning
West Sussex County Council
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RH

FAO Mr Chris Bartlett

Dear Sirs,
WSCC/030/21, Clay quarry and CMRF, Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood

I understand that the applicant's agent, Protreat Ltd, has submitted additional information in respect of the above application and I now write in response to this, and to further my earlier objection to the application.

I have previously lived within walking distance of the site. I have since regularly walked in Pallinghurst Woods and continue to do so. I believe that I have every right to object to the application, apparently contrary to the view of Protreat Ltd.

I note that the established policies of WSCC are criticised in the additional documents. This is inappropriate and should not be a consideration; any application should comply with the relevant policies.

The revised application now claims:

- that there is an unmet demand for construction recycling facilities
- that there is a shortfall in the reserves of clay in Surrey

No evidence is provided for either of the above and these points should be discounted.

It is also claimed that there are other potential customers for the clay, but who they are is not specified. It should be noted that the application is for the extraction of clay for brick making, other uses presumably may not be considered. The economics of transporting low value raw clay over long distances preclude other uses as far as is understood.

The applicant makes reference to distant brickworks, one of which (West Hoathly) is closed. Another, Swanage, has an on site clay pit and is not comparable. The suggestion that a brickworks could also be built nearby to process the clay on site is totally impractical - the site is many miles from any mains gas supply which would be necessary to fire the bricks economically.

The prospect of the necessary security fencing alongside PRO 792-1, which it is now proposed remains open, is not acceptable, nor would the necessary floodlighting be.

An automatic barrier is proposed on Bridleway 3240. The bridleway will be required to be open 24/7. The site power is to be provide by a generator. Will the legal requirement that the bridleway remain open require the generator to run 24/7 - adding to the previously stated issues over power generation?

I understand that the number of vehicle movements may be seriously underestimated by the applicant and would ask that this be given careful attention. I also gather that there issues with the access visibility, particularly with a west bound truck waiting to turn into the site off the main road, and again would ask that this be carefully considered.

The pressing matter of water neutrality has not been considered at all, nor have environmental requirements been met in respect of bats, nor have the requirements of habitat assessments been fully met, nor are the biodiversity requirements been met under NERC2006 apparently.

There are issues over contradictory statements regarding ownership of the site and other woodland, possible mitigation of biodiversity loss, and clear difficulties with any possible future change of ownership of differing parcels of land to which mitigation might be relevant in the future.

In conclusion, I do not feel the additional information provided alters the situation and I continue to object to this inappropriate application.

Yours faithfully,

Gareth Hayton