

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Application number | WSCC/030/21  |
| Name               | Malcolm Crabbe   |
| Address            | HOLLIES, PIGBUSH LANE, PIGBUSH LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0QY   |
| Type of Comment    | Objection  |
| Comments           | <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Once again, I am writing to strenuously object to Loxwood Clay Pits planning application number WSCC/030/21. As I understand it this company want to extract clay for brick making and then backfill with construction waste in an area of existing ancient woodland.</p> <p>I object on various counts as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) According to the WSCC Minerals Monitoring Report, there is no demand for additional brickmaking Clay as WSCC have more than 25 years of reserves therefore there is no need to extract this clay. Furthermore, it makes no sense to extract clay and transport it as this is environmentally unsound practice but rather the extraction normally takes place alongside brickmaking facilities. This is not the case here.</li><li>2) This is a greenfield site and national policy states that waste sites should be built in built up areas or brownfield sites. This is obviously not the case here.</li><li>3) I gather the applicant now does not suggest the closure of footpath 792-1 (but importantly does not detail any mitigation of the noise/dust and safety of the public). Further the HGV lorries will be crossing various other footpaths in the woods giving rise to serious safety concerns. The suggested automatic barrier is not adequate, especially if only working one way. This is not acceptable.</li><li>4) The applicants seem confused about the relationship with the owners of Pallingshurst wood. On the one hand they suggest there is no connection when it suits them but they also state they will mitigate biodiversity loss through gains in the woodland which is in common control! Both cannot be true. Regardless the woodland could change ownership and therefore cannot be used to mitigate biodiversity loss.</li><li>5) It would seem that the number of vehicle movements is seriously underestimated in the proposal but more importantly the visibility at the site entrance is less than the minimum required. There is serious concern of cars colliding into the rear of HGVs waiting to turn into site.</li><li>6) The applicant has presented no justification for the requirement of increased construction waste recycling capacity.</li><li>7) There are major environmental concerns relating to bats and badgers in the impacted area. There has been a bat survey but this does not focus on the use of the woodland for bats commuting to their foraging areas. Having done a bat survey for our house on Pigbush Lane, I know that there are many bast in the area that use these corridors for travelling. This is of major concern and needs to be addressed. The bat survey also refers to Horsham policies rather than Chichester which shows a general ineptitude which would no doubt continue into their operation of the site.</li></ol> <p>The applicant shows no regard for the feeling of the local community, seem to be trying to ignore comments from people not in their own 'designated area' and shows little attention to detail which would suggest that if this application were to pass they would ride roughshod over the rules and regulations and pay little heed to the nitty gritty. The whole operation will be a disaster with many potential safety hazards.</p> <p>Please stop this in its tracks.</p> |
| Received           | 09/02/2022 11:10:26  |
| Attachments        |  |