

L Maclean
Little Spy Cottage
Spy Lane
Loxwood
RH14 0 SQ

Feb 22

With regard to planning Ref WSCC/030/21

I would like to vehemently oppose this application that is being made by persons from well outside the local area who would seem to have a disregard for the planning system, the local people and most importantly the tranquil site they wish to destroy.

I find it ironic that the applicant and their agents (who are both from well outside the area) have been trying to differentiate and eject the opinions of opposers to their application, who too are from outside the area, even if they have enjoyed the woodlands for many years and have much more experience of the site than the applicants!

I oppose for the following reasons

- Waste and Minerals Policies – the applicant who is neither local or sympathetic to the area appears to attack the Local plans and County policies rather than adhere to them.
- There is no proven need for the applicants clay. However, there is significant evidence there are suitable reserves to meet the policy. The applicants agents have seemingly approached local brick making facilities but have bought none to the application as evidence of wanting their clay. Surely if you wanted to prove a point you would bring evidence?
- The applicant has no evidence of a need for Construction Recycling Facility and evidence suggests the system can clearly match the need for the foreseeable future. The applicant fails to see the advances in legislation and drive towards carbon neutrality and sustainability as limiting the need for Construction Recycling Facilities on sites such as this presented.
- The site is tranquil and a superb amenity for a great many people from far and wide. The negative impact on the site for users of the local PROWs would be enormous. The development will drive people from this beautiful area.
- I am pleased to see the applicant has removed the closure of PROW 792-1 from the initial application. This is the main footpath that traverses the woodlands but the location of the proposed site right by the footpath will have an unacceptable impact on the PROW with noise, dust, vibration and the amenity of the public right of way.
- PROW 795 needs to allow pedestrian and HGV's in the same place (along with cattle)! The applicant has not demonstrated how the people / traffic interface could be made safe and fails to recognise the equal right of way and in light of the recent change of the highway

code how pedestrians, horses and cyclists can be considered against HGV's throughout both the site and highways to the A281.

- The traffic assessment by the Stop The Clay Pits Action Group appears to understand the risks far better than the assessments by the agent for LCP. The route to the A281 is a local, rural road with horses, pedestrians, cyclists alike using it. A conservative estimate is an increase in HGV traffic of 300% on a road not designed for such vehicles. At a time Rudgwick Brickworks Restoration will be complete significantly reducing HGV movements again in just couple of months? The applicant has not recognised or accepted that the risks involved getting HGV's onto and off the junction with the A281 42 or more times a day are unacceptable. They fail to see the dangers of an HGV joining the A281. The sightlines at the layby are also significantly below what is recommended and I feel the applicant is relying on vegetation (on a third parties property) being regularly cleared. I feel the applicants inappropriate assessment of the traffic risks and failure to assess the impact on other users a significant cause for refusing the application.
- Is there a biodiversity net gain? I may have missed it.
- There is very little argument for local jobs as the jobs created will not attract local people. There are no shops nearby for lunchbreak, no public transport to get people to site, so wholly unattractive for most local people. There is such vehement opposition to the site that no one will want to work there picking rubbish for close to minimum wage. Plant operatives and the services that would be provided for the site would all need to come from further afield.

In summary, the application is not suitable for the area proposed. There is no evidence for a strategic need for either the clay or the void it creates that can't be met already and even if there was a proven need there are many more suitable sites already available. The proposal is outdated with current drives for sustainability and a low carbon economy. It will not benefit the local economy and would destroy otherwise beautiful woodland.

Regards

L Maclean

Loxwood Resident