

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Robert Burse"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="7, WOODFIELD ROAD, RUDGWICK, HORSHAM, RH12 3EP"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I have noted the applicant has submitted additional information to WSCC but having considered this I still feel nothing has fundamentally changed and my initial objection stands. My main concerns are as follows.</p> <p>Demand for Additional Construction Recycling Capacity -the applicant has presented no further justification of the need for additional construction materials recycling in West Sussex.</p> <p>Demand for Clay - The application continues to contravene WSCC Minerals Policy M5. The applicant has argued the clay on site is suitable for brick making so WSCC can only consider extraction for that purpose. Claims by the applicant about the demand for clay and potential uses for it are questionable and unsubstantiated. For example mention is made of a shortfall of clay in Surrey but no evidence has been submitted. No specific customers for the clay have been named. LCP continually refer to the West Hoathly brickworks but this is now closed and is of no relevance to the application. The applicant suggests the closure is an example of failing WSCC policy whereas it is a straightforward commercial decision by Istock Brick. LCP also suggest Pitsham Brickworks is relevant but it is not as they use a different type of clay, i.e. not Weald Clay.</p> <p>PROWs and Safety - It seems the applicant no longer proposes to request the closure of the footpath along the northern boundary of the site (PROW 792-1), but is silent on the related consequences. For example, how will the impact for PROW users be mitigated (noise, dust, loss of amenity and tranquillity), safety concerns, PROW users and HGV will still share PROW 795, etc.</p> <p>Transport:- this is a huge concern and I believe the applicant is grossly underestimating the number of vehicle movements. The impact on Loxwood Road and the A281 junction is significant and I believe has the potential for accidents, near misses, etc. The Loxwood Road is simply not suitable for the amount of traffic and is not designed to take 2 of the proposed lorries passing each other at several points.</p> <p>Ecology and Water Neutrality - it is noted that the applicant has now submitted a Habitats Regulations Assessment but the woodland supports many interesting species of wildlife which have not been fully taken into account. This area is well recognised by numerous authorities as being water stressed. The applicant has made no attempt to provide details of how they will overcome the water-stress issues which exist. The new Bat Survey is insufficient as it only covers very few specific trees in the direct development site and does not cover the wider woodland area which will be affected and disrupted by the development.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="03/02/2022 15:05:46"/>
Attachments	