

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Alicia Bridger"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="PEMBERLEY, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SQ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I write to lodge my objections to the Applicant's further submissions, which I ask you to consider in addition to my objection to the original application. I object on the following basis:-</p> <p>A) it concerns me greatly that the Applicant has taken a critical view of WSCC's own mineral and waste policies that have been put in place to safeguard communities and the environment. I find it very concerning that the Applicant would even adopt this stance when emphasis should be on compliance!</p> <p>B) No further evidence has been submitted to support the need for construction materials in West Sussex. They say there is a shortfall of clay in Surrey but no evidence has been submitted to support this claim. The Applicant says their application would give rise to the development of a new local brickworks but this would of course be subject to a planning application and would seem at odds with the decision by Ibstock Brick to close West Hoathly brickworks because it was no longer financially viable. It is worth noting this company has its own on site clay pit! To claim the Weald clay would be used by Pitsham Brickworks is irrelevant as they do not use Weald Clay.</p> <p>C) No solutions have been put forward to mitigate loss of amenity, noise, dust and tranquility or to provide barrier fencing to the footpath even if the Applicant has now withdrawn their application to close it.</p> <p>D) A recent consultant's report indicates that the Applicant is seriously underestimating the number of movements of heavy vehicles by up to a possible 200%. As stated previously, Loxwood is a peaceful rural village with a road-system that is wholly unsuitable for such a purpose. The pressure this amount of vehicles would place on the local environment would be intolerable and dangerous.</p> <p>E) We understand the recent Consultation report also expresses grave concerns for the increased risk of cars travelling west towards Loxwood colliding into the rear of a lorry waiting to enter the LCP entrance at the lay-by entrance.</p> <p>F) The Applicant's submissions regarding provision for the local wildlife do not go far enough and only relate to trees in the direct development site and not the rest of the woodland.</p> <p>G) we understand a recent survey undertaken into bats living in the woodland was not very comprehensive and actually included trees that the Applicant will fell should the Application be successful. There is no real concern for the impact on biodiversity in the woodland, particularly the local bat population and is in contravention of the Duty conferred on the District (NERC 2006) to have regard to biodiversity.</p> <p>H) the area in question is one that is already water stressed. The applicant has not made any new submissions to combat the problem.</p> <p>I) The Applicant has not set out how the proposed barrier across the HGV access and bridleway 3240 will be powered? A single barrier can only be placed across one side of the bridleway but HGV traffic will travel in both directions. It is therefore not clear how the risk to users of the footpath will be mitigated.</p> <p>In summary, this Application provides no advantage to the local community other than to the Applicant's themselves and many real concerns to local residents remain unaddressed. I therefore still wholeheartedly object to the application for a Clay Pit.</p> <p>Alicia Bridger</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="07/02/2022 13:14:14"/>
Attachments	