

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Peter Tanner"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="WOODFIELD ROAD, 24, WOODFIELD ROAD, HORSHAM, RH12 3EP"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Despite amendments to this application, I still wish to object on the following grounds; The applicant has a total disregard to policies set for situations such as this. For example, the disregard for WSCC Waste and Minerals Policy, with the applicant being critical of a policy which is there to protect communities and the environment.</p> <p>This application still lacks in justification for a facility such as this with no evidence that further capacity for the recycling of building materials is required.</p> <p>Still the applicant states that the extraction of clay is needed, and we have to assume for bricks, but still brickworks continue to close with all historical brickworks now gone in this locality. With the cost to transport clay to other facilities outweighing the value of clay, and no brickworks as part of the application, the potential use of the extracted clay remains a total mystery. For the site to act a recycling facility, it is essential that clay is first extracted and used rather than simply moved.</p> <p>I am also at a loss that the organisation who are the applicants state that they do not own Pallinghust Woods yet they also state that they will offset biodiversity loss through gains in the woodland. A woodland they do not own! Enhancing biodiversity is a long process that takes many years. Far longer than any potential lease of land to manage this, so it is unlikely that the organisation would achieve this unless they had ownership. Something they deny.</p> <p>By far the best way to offset biodiversity is to leave it alone and prevent needless developments such as this.</p> <p>Finally, I am totally surprised that the applicant wishes to disregard any objection based on where the objector lives. The environment belongs to us all and wilful destruction is a concern for anyone. If geographical location is a basis for objecting, it should also be a restriction for applying. Until that time, anyone has a right to object to the destruction of the environment.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="08/02/2022 07:15:35"/>
Attachments	