

# Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/030/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Emma Mitchison"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="1 CROSSWAYS COTTAGE, PETWORTH ROAD, PETWORTH ROAD, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0DR"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Further to my initial objection I wish to comment once more on this disastrous application.</p> <p>I see very little change in the submission that changes the nature of the original application therefore all of my previous objections remain the same. In fact reading some of the new information it's only raised further concerns and questions about this wholly unsuitable application.</p> <p>I find that the applicants tactic to establish home address of any objector and eradicate those out side of their chosen area is unsavoury.</p> <p>From a public safety aspect, the public right of way users and HGV will still use the same public right of way, 795.</p> <p>It's suggested that an automatic barrier for HGV access crosses bridleway 3240 and footpath, yet it does not address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1)That a single barrier can only be placed on one side of the bridleway, yet HGV traffic will travel in both directions???</li><li>2)There has been no mention of how this will be powered</li><li>3)It's not been made clear how the risk to public users of the path will be mitigated..</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, the applicant no longer proposes to request the closure of the footpath along the northern boundary of the site (PROW 792-1), but has said nothing about the related consequences of this. For example how will the impact for PROW users be mitigated, noise, dust, loss of amenity and tranquillity.</p> <p>There have been no details about boundary security and fencing around a site which will have deep pits, this must be a major concern.</p> <p>The waste and minerals policies in place to protect our community and the environment from inappropriate development have been criticised when they should be complied with not questioned surely??</p> <p>There has been no further justification of the need for additional construction materials recycling in WS.</p> <p>transport consultants have advised of underestimating the number of vehicles to and fro, and they consider that there would or could be 200% more than LCP have said. This would drastically increases the impact on Loxwood Road and the A281 junction but also access through the tranquility of the woodland.</p> <p>Transport consultants have further advised that the visibility at the entrance is even less than the absolute minimum figure the applicant is relying on. There is a Further concern about the increased risk of a car travelling west, towards Loxwood colliding into the rear of an HGV waiting to enter the LCP site at the lay-by entrance. This is already a hazard for cars without this added risk!</p> <p>It is calculated that In the UK, around 41% of species have declined since 1970 due to environmental pressures, for example habitat loss which this application would impact. A Biodiversity Emergency was declared in 2019 by the IPBES. That underscores the importance of this area.</p> <p>The area is recognised as being water stressed. However the applicant has made no attempt to provide details as to how they will address this issues.</p> <p>The Bat Survey being referenced relates to Horsham District wildlife and biodiversity policies. Yet this site is in Chichester district, so how does this relate??</p> <p>The applicant makes claims of a shortfall of clay in Surrey, however no evidence has been submitted on this basis.</p>

Received

09/02/2022 22:24:11

Attachments