## Comment for planning application WSCC/030/21

Application number Name

WSCC/030/21

Peter Nataraj

Address

STATION ROAD, 5, STATION ROAD, BILLINGSHURST, RH14 0SN

Type of Comment Comments

Objection

Further to my previous objection, I understand the applicant has delivered further information and wish to add to my objection.

They state that only objections in the immediate vicinity should be noted. This is despite the applicants residing outside this area themselves.

The amenities they intend to destroy are used by people outwith the immediate area regularly (including my family members who visit weekly). Given the length of intended disruption (30 years) and the current building development in the area there are many people who have not yet moved here who will be directly affected by the loss of amenity and the disruption to the environment, including road usage. Their objections clearly should be heard.

Policy objection - it is not the role of the applicant to question policy. They must adhere to it, which they clearly are not it is also the role of the planning authority to make sure the policy is enforced. The premise of the application is clear. There is a desire to make a recycling facility on green belt land. The excuse given is to fill a hole produced by clay extraction. Without the need for the hole there is no need to fill it. There is clearly no demand for clay to the extant they suggest and absolutely no need for a low value commodity to be transported over any distance. There is no need or requirement to dig the hole!

No valid mitigation has been provided for the safe shared use of the woodland with HGV's and the pedestrian or horse mounted public. Given the change in bias of the recent Highway Code to prioritise pedestrians and cycles it is clearly the opposite to the applicants intention.

There is no mitigation given or constructive argument made for the increased use of HGV on local roads not intended for the purpose.

The damage seen on other local roads is going to be paid for through damage to local vehicles and paid for in local taxes - the road maintainance costs should be born by the applicant.

The highways assessment originally delivered is contradictory and flawed. There is no sufficient clear line of sight around the planned entrance. The insufficient visibility will be compromised further with high vegetation as seen every summer The conclusions of that report could not show sufficient braking distance available even using reduced average speed. Data gathered in a questionable manner from a reduced sample size and not using any sensible forward traffic growth predictions. A poor piece of work entirely unsuitable for a safety critical decision.

Received

10/02/2022 09:16:35

Attachments