

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Diane Dickins"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="1, PERRY LODGE, TISMANS COMMON, TISMANS COMMON, HORSHAM, RH12 3DY"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Further to my original objection I would like to comment on the new information provided by Loxwood Claypits Ltd.</p> <p>I have read nothing in this additional information from the applicant that supports the application. It still fails to address the environmental and local community concerns.</p> <p>I do not understand why the applicants feel people living outside the area have no right to object. The footpaths through the woods are, at present, a delight for walkers, and horse and bike riders many of whom may come here from afar specifically to enjoy the quiet solitude of these woods. They should have as much right to object as those of us who live in the surrounding area. The beauty of these woods should be for everyone to enjoy using the public rights of way, just as our family and friends who visit enjoy long tranquil walks so different from their town surroundings. They too should be able to object as they will also be losing a very special place.</p> <p>The policies that WSCC have in place regarding waste and minerals are precisely to protect the environment from unnecessary and inappropriate development. What point is there in the applicant complaining about them?</p> <p>It appears that the applicant is grossly underestimating the amount of heavy traffic they would create which could actually be 200% more than they state. The resulting impact on the narrow local roads would be immense and the danger to other roads users motorists, horses, bicycle and pedestrians on roads which are very narrow in parts, will undoubtedly cause serious accidents. The huge increase in traffic, particularly heavy vehicles, will contribute to making the already potholed roads, even worse. Plus visibility at the entrance to the site is actually less than the applicant has presented. There is the danger of a serious accident at the site entrance when lorries are coming and going due to the poor visibility.</p> <p>There is no indication as to any security fencing around the site which will contain all kinds of dangers and which is bordered by a public footpath. PROW 795 will actually be shared with HGV and PROW users which will undoubtedly result in accidents and potential injury to both humans and animals. It is also unclear how the intended automatic barrier being erected across bridleway 3240 will mitigate the risk to the public who use the path. Plus the barrier is only to be across one half of the bridleway but the lorries will travel in both directions. Neither is there any indication as to how the barrier will be powered.</p> <p>As stated before the area particularly in winter, becomes very waterlogged and has been recognised as being water stressed by many authorities. The applicant has given no plan as to how this will be solved. The new Bat Survey does not cover the wider woodland area and the disruption the development will cause. Bats use the woods for feeding and have to travel to foraging areas and as many trees are to be felled, they will definitely suffer. The applicant has also neglected to mention the now updated European Protected Species status now we have left the EU. We have lost about 45% of species due to loss of habitat and it is our duty to preserve what little of this precious habitation such as these woods contain that we have left. There are numerous species of wildlife and species that have not been covered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>The applicant states they will mitigate biodiversity loss using woodland but it is not possible to recreate a biodiversity that has developed naturally over thousands of years. Once lost it is lost forever.</p> <p>At a time when we are all very aware of climate change and the loss of trees and natural habitat across the country, it seems unthinkable that this project should be allowed to go ahead when it is neither needed nor wanted by the local community.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="07/02/2022 14:27:57"/>
Attachments	