

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Jane Ayres"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="OAKEN BARN, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0RW"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I should like to reconfirm my previous objection. I do not feel any of the new documents mitigate the extensive impacts to the environment, local and wider community and raise new ones. The site remains a greenfield one and as such all efforts made by WSCC to retain it as such.</p> <p>The combative stance taken by the consortium / applicant's agent in communication with the Council, including their criticism of the current WSCC waste and minerals policy, which their plan still contravenes, is similar to what members of the community experienced during the public consultation last year. Their approach in trying to identify where objectors live as a bearing on individuals right to object is irrelevant, as people travel far and wide to benefit from using these woodlands and all voices have a right to be heard, not be muzzled by a developer using an arbitrary distance to suit his needs.</p> <p>As a daily user of the Loxwood Road, living close to the proposed site entrance and experiencing the volume of traffic taking the blind bend at speed daily, I still do not feel the application adequately addresses the safety aspects of the proposal on all the road users close to the proposed entrance. I regularly must brake sharply or speed up when leaving my driveway, new temporary signage in place for the current logging operation has not slowed traffic down or changed behaviour. I am genuinely concerned for the frequent non-motorised users of the road. It is very common to follow horses heading for Bridleway 3240 and groups of cyclists (both of whom should be more protected by the Highway Code changes at the end of this month), on approach to and from the proposed site entrance off the Loxwood Road. The school bus now also stops close to the entrance and a public footpath crosses the road adjacent to the proposed entrance on the bend to meet another PROW heading towards the canal. All these users will be exposed to the HGV traffic.</p> <p>As a user of the woodland, any access to PROW's (via footpath 795), would still be crossed by numerous HGV's daily and there is not sufficient mitigation given to the protection of all users. Again, the new Highway Code should offer more protection to safety of all users, but this has not been addressed by the applicant. In fact, it is still not clear how the applicant will minimise the risk to all public users of the footpath and bridleway.</p> <p>The submission still has not delivered any proof of the need for clay and still fails to name a single customer for it. Inclusion of the extensive 32-page brochure about Ibstock bricks, seems to simply be a diversionary tactic to share further pages of irrelevant information to bulk out their documents.</p> <p>I feel the timing of a current logging operation, damaging the edges of the trackway where wild orchids would normally appear in Spring and stacking cut logs remarkably close to an active badger sett (disappointing to see from Tilhill, the land management company), is making the proposed site entrance look far more industrialised than it ever has been. So that when the Council visit, they see an access already chewed up on approach to the proposed waste site, rather than the totally pristine area it was just a few months ago.</p> <p>This site remains unsuitable for the proposal and hopefully the Council will reach the same conclusion and firmly reject it when it comes to the committee.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="31/01/2022 16:08:28"/>
Attachments	