

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	WSCC/030/21
Name	Susan Hyem
Address	BARS CORNER, ALFOLD BARS, LOXWOOD, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0QS
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>Response to the additional informationsubmitted by Loxwood Claypits Ltd (LCP)</p> <p>NPPF I note that amongst their several hundred pages of additional information - many of which are irrelevant to this application - LCP includes extracts from the NPPF. Amongst other things, the NPPF clearly states that "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons". The proposed development is within a wider area which contains ancient woodland, and the noise, activity, dust and light pollution resulting - however limited - would have an adverse effect on the surrounding woodland flora and fauna, including orchids, bats and owls. LCP have provided no exceptional reasons for siting this commercial development within this woodland. They have failed to provide evidence of a shortfall of clay supplies in Surrey, nor have they provided any further justification for the alleged need for additional construction materials recycling in West Sussex. The NPPF also states that "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location..... and identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value". This woodland area site for the proposed development is completely inappropriate. It is a tranquil area. It is undisturbed by noise, apart from occasional woodland maintenance operations. It is prized by numerous residents in the surrounding villages for its recreational and amenity value, and has been for very many years. The local authority therefore has a duty to refuse this application.</p> <p>PROWs and Safety I note that the applicant proposes a single automatic barrier at the junction of bridleway 3240 and the access track to the proposed development. This does not significantly mitigate the risk to public users of the bridleway, particularly young children, with HGVs crossing the bridleway at frequent intervals. PROWs run close to the site of the proposed development. Users will have their enjoyment of the area significantly reduced by the noise, and commercial activity, and there would be issues of safety for the public, who would be walking close to what would become very large pits, following clay extraction.</p> <p>PROW 795 This would be shared by HGVs and recreational users, raising safety concerns, and loss of amenity value for recreational users.</p> <p>Proposed HGV Access Point via Layby Many recreational users of the woodland area park their vehicles in the layby which will be bisected by the proposed site access road. Most users enter the layby at one end and exit at the other end, due to the narrow hard standing, meaning they would have to cross the proposed access road, raising the possibility of collision with HGVs, particularly in poor weather/visibiliy conditions. There is also the potential risk of injury to young children and dogs when recreational users exit and return to their vehicles, as they will be in close proximiy to entering and exiting HGVs. This risk does not exist at present.</p> <p>Restoration of the Area Following Closure of the Proposed Site The applicant makes great play of restoring the area of the proposed development with lakes, and planting to improve the habitat. However, this will not happen for 33 years. The climate crisis is now, and we should be preserving unspoilt habitat now, not damaging it and promising to repair it at some distant point in the future.</p> <p>I confirm my previous objection to this application.</p>
Received	05/02/2022 11:53:19
Attachments	