

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Karen Brimblecombe"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="ROBINS POST, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SS"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I have previously detailed my reasons for objecting to this application. Having looked at the additional information submitted by the applicant I continue to object and in my view WSCC should refuse for the following reasons:</p> <p>West Sussex County Council has adequate reserves of clay. It also has sufficient waste processing capacity.</p> <p>The excavation of a commercially insignificant quantity of clay from the proposed site simply to provide a hole which would then be filled with demolition waste is not an acceptable reason to approve the application.</p> <p>This is a greenfield site which is not sufficiently close to the lorry route network and even if there was demand for either clay or demolition waste processing there would be far more suitable locations elsewhere within the county.</p> <p>The applicant continues to fail to demonstrate that there is any commercial demand for the extracted clay. It is my view that the applicant's proposals would give rise to significant transport and highway safety issues. These have been made clear by the technical reports obtained by the local campaign group which I understand have been submitted to you.</p> <p>The applicant's proposal would still provide significant conflict with public rights of way notwithstanding that the applicant appears to have dropped their proposal to close/re-route one of the public rights of way.</p> <p>HGVs and the public would still be sharing PROW 795 which would inevitably lead to significant risks to the safety of the public.</p> <p>The latest information submitted by the applicant doesn't provide any new detail about noise or light pollution.</p> <p>The applicant's own report seems to suggest that the development would result in a bio diversity loss on the proposed site.</p> <p>Attempts to offset this by gains on other areas of woodland which they don't own should not and cannot be relied on.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is my view that WSCC should reject the application.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="05/02/2022 12:56:16"/>
Attachments	