

Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Libby Morris"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="1 NEW COTTAGES, SPY LANE, SPY LANE, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SQ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I'm writing to further object to the Loxwood Clay Pits planning application. Following the additional information provided by the LCP, I'd like to raise my objection again.</p> <p>In the LCP's application they criticize the WSCC mineral and waste policies which are set out to protect the local environment and the community from inappropriate development. Therefore, The LCP's criticism raises suspicion of their intentions. As the policy is there for protection.</p> <p>In addition, the LPC does not provide sufficient evidence for the demand and potential uses of the clay. They state that there's a shortfall of clay in Surrey however there is no evidence submitted for this. LPC suggests that they will create new small brickworks. In contrast they make the comparison to Ibstock Swanage UK Brickmaker which is completely irrelevant as they are owned by the largest UK Brickmaker. Additionally they have a clay pit onsite. As well as this the applicant refers to West Hoathly Brickworks stating that their closure was due to WSCC failings. However, this was simply a commercial decision from Ibstock Brick,</p> <p>The applicant continuously fails to provide evidence, and practical solutions about how they plan to deal with consequences of their plan. For example, how does the applicant propose to address the impact for PROW users. Especially with sensory impact like noise and dust. Lack of safety remains evident as HGV and PROW users share PROW 795. How is that safe to use especially with a community of many elderly people and young families. This lack of safety proposals continue with no stated details about boundary security around the site. Therefore, the applicant's proposal needs to be addressed for a lack of concern for public safety and consequences of their actions.</p> <p>I am also deeply concerned about the local ecology. I note the applicant has filed a Habitat Regulations assessment. However, this still lacks to consider many important species in the local area. Furthermore, the new bat survey is insufficient. It targets a few specific trees - some of which are planned to be felled. This suggests a lack of care as the applicant has not carried out appropriate assessment for the whole area that their proposal will impact. Comically the applicant's bat survey is referring to Horsham District council wildlife and biodiversity policy when the site is in chichester district. Therefore the applicant's additions to the detrimental impact of biodiversity should be rejected because the applicant continues to ignore the fundamental flaws in their original application.</p> <p>A transport consultant suggests that the applicant severely underestimates the amount of vehicle movement. It has been suggested that there would and could be 200% more than LPC says. In addition, the consultant stressed a visibility issue at the site entrance with even lower visibility than the minimum LPC is relying on. As a result, this again is concerning for LPC's lack of care and attention to the safety implication of their proposal.</p> <p>In conclusion, I firmly object to LCP planning application on the ground of safety concerns, impact to biodiversity, transport implications, and a lack of supporting evidence for the demand and application of clay.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="09/02/2022 16:23:09"/>
Attachments	