From: [redacted]
To: PL Planning Applications
Subject: OBJECTION - WSCC/030/21 - February 9th 2022
Date: 09 February 2022 13:15:16

OBJECTION to Planning Application WSCC/030/21 – An application for planning permission for a clay quarry and construction materials recycling facility in Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood Road, Loxwood, West Sussex RH14 0RW

Response to further information submitted to WSCC by the applicant

From : Fiona Wallace, Motts Cottage, Loxwood Road, Rudgwick, West Sussex RH12 3BS
Email : [redacted]

I write to reconfirm my previous objection to this application. All of my reasons for objecting still stand on the basis that nothing or very little in this additional information materially changes the nature of the original application – it fails to address any real/fundamental issues or concerns and remains non-compliant with WSCC's minerals and waste policies in numerous ways. It is still an unwelcome proposal in totally the wrong place. It does however, raise some further concerns and questions which I will address below:

Waste and Minerals Policies: The applicant has chosen to be critical of WSCC minerals and waste policies, which like them or not, have been drawn up in consultation and are there to help protect our community and environment from inappropriate development.

Demand for Additional Construction Recycling Capacity: The applicant has failed to set out any justification for additional construction materials recycling capacity in the county.

Demand for Clay: The application is still non-compliant with policy, specifically WSCC minerals policy M5. The applicant has argued the clay on site is suitable for brick making so surely that is the only purpose for which it can be considered? Claims by the applicant about the demand for clay and potential other uses for it are not supported by evidence and therefore to my mind, irrelevant.

PROWs and Safety: It is now suggested that the closure of the footpath along the northern boundary of the site (PROW 792-1) is no longer required, but the applicant is silent on the mitigation of new risks arising to footpath users from noise, pollution and safety issues.
Footpath users and HGV's will still share PROW 795 – there is no separation; the access track and the footpath are one and the same.

Ownership and Biodiversity: The applicant states that the owners of the company Loxwood Clay Pits Limited are not the same as the owners of Pallinghurst Woods. I would question therefore how they can then claim that the biodiversity loss will be mitigated through gains on the woodland which is in common control by the Danhash family and Loxwood Claypits Ltd. Surely net biodiversity must apply within the site of the proposed operation, not be reliant on the surrounding land.

Transport: The transport concerns and risks on the Loxwood Road, at the proposed site entrance and the access through the woodland remain considerable. I understand from the work of a transport consultant engaged by the community action group, the applicant is potentially underestimating the number of vehicle movements, which they indicate could be 200% more than the applicant's prediction. In addition, their advice indicates that visibility at the site entrance is even less than the applicant minimum figure, thereby increasing the risk of collision between vehicles on the Loxwood Road and any HGV's waiting to enter the site.
The safety risks to pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists etc. on the Loxwood Road are underscored/
reinforced by the introduction of the new Highway Code. How will passing distances will be observed on many parts of the Loxwood Road? Yet another point on which the applicant remains silent.

One final comment on this additional information submitted by the applicant. I find the attempts by the applicant to discredit WSCC policies and personnel reprehensible and not the least helpful or informative. Compound this with their assertions that (1) the Community Action Group, Stoptheclaypit, has acted disingenuously and (2) that objections should only count if they come from specific geographic locations, highly disrespectful of the democratic process.

In summary, the additional information has not addressed the fundamental flaws in the original application and does not add any merit to the nature of the proposed development. It remains a manifest destruction of beautiful woodland, its surroundings and environment. Therefore again, I confirm my strongest possible **OBJECTION to this application.**

Fiona M Wallace

[redacted]