From: [redacted]
To: PL Planning Applications
Subject: WSCC/030/21
Date: 31 January 2022 13:23 56
Attachments: Clay Pit Jan 22 GPE.dotx

C
opper
Beech,
T
he
Ridge,

Rudgwick,

West Sussex.

RH12 3HF

[redacted]

31 January 2022

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application Number WSCC/030/21

I have already objected to this application, however regarding ProTreat's additional comments I would like to comment further
I cannot see that there is much in the additional comments that support this application.
The applicant should abide by the waste and minerals policy rather than complain about it. I can see no further evidence given for the demand for clay nor for additional construction materials recycling. The applicant's argument for where the clay might be transported is very vague.
It is gratifying that the applicant has changed the requirement for closing a public right of way. However, this does not mitigate the noise, pollution and potential danger that the proposed site would impose on walkers.
The applicant's arguments about mitigation of biodiversity loss are very woolly and vague. There is no doubt that there would be a major effect on ecology and wildlife if the plan went ahead. It appears that only a very limited study has been made of the wildlife that would be lost. In particular, it appears as though the bat survey has not been carried out with sufficient diligence.
There is nothing in the additional comments that alleviates my major concern about the safety implications of so many heavy lorry movements along what is effectively a narrow country road. The points of entry from the site into this road and then from the road onto the A281 are dangerous with poor sightlines and will be made more so with the movement of many lorries each day.
In conclusion, there are no mitigating points in ProTreat's additional comments and I ask you please to reject this application.

Yours,

Geoff Evans

Sent from Mail for Windows

Virus-free. www.avast.com