

Objections to Planning Application WSCC/030/21

– Additional Information –

An application for planning permission for a clay quarry and construction materials recycling facility in Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood Road, Loxwood, West Sussex RH14 0RW

These are my objections to the additional information supplied by LCP/Protreat re planning application – WSCC/030/21

Reasons for objection:

Clay Operation

- West Sussex County Council does not have any shortage of clay supplies, with 3 very large brickworks having a supply of more than 25 years, and another with at least 24 years. So the required need is met, so there is no need for the clay pit
- The applicant has not provided any information that shows they have a customer for their clay
- The applicant says a small artisan brickworks may take their clay, but gives no evidence to show that such a brick works exists or gives any location for it
- There is a reason that brickworks are built alongside very large deposits of brick clay. It costs too much to truck clay from elsewhere for brick making to be economic
- Could it be that the purpose for the clay pit, is to have a tax-free way of dumping construction material that cannot be recycled? Or that without a hole in the ground, there is no possible reason to have a Construction Material Recycling Facility (CMRF) in such a location? These are questions I ask myself, but I acknowledge that I do not know the motives of the applicant. But whatever is the case there is no need for clay, so I see no cause for the council to approve it

Waste Operation

- In my previous objection, and in the objections of others it was made clear that there is no demonstrated need for additional CMRF provision. In the new material the applicant has not provided any new information on this
- The applicant states that the distance from the site to the Lorry Route Network (LRN) is only 1 mile as a crow flies, but crows are not going to be asked to carry the clay or building material waste. The minimum distance for the lorries that will do so, to the lorry route network at the A281 at Bucks Green, is a total of 4.8 km (3 miles). 1.6 km along a forest track through exquisite woodland, and 3.2 km along a narrow unclassified country road (not a B-road)

Transport and Highways

- The report of the transport consultants RSK provides evidence (taking account of LCP's revised figure of 80% recycling and recovery for the CMRF) that there would be in the order of 128 traffic movements per day of large HGVs and skip lorries. Not the 42 that LCP/Protreat have been telling the community since the beginning of their consultation process
- With 128 movements over a 10-hour day, that would average as one HGV/skip lorry travelling along the small rural road between Loxwood and Bucks Green, EVERY 5 MINUTES, between 7.00 and 17.00. From this development alone. That is not safe for pedestrians, cyclists, car users, and heavy vehicle drivers

Other

- The applicant has decided they no longer wish to close footpath 792/1 for 33 years. That would be of no benefit to all the people who used to take that path, if the application were to be approved. Who would want to take that route, if there was a huge recycling building noisily working there all day, and if there were extraction vehicles digging and moving clay in deep pits right next to the path?
- To be a sustainable development, a few, poorly paid manual jobs cannot over-rule massive environmental harm, major danger of accident and huge loss of social amenity and tranquillity for the community
- Is it right that the applicant has not affirmed, on the planning application form, that they own the mineral rights where the development is proposed? If that is the case, how can the application proceed at all?
- I find the tone of communication from Protreat/LCP to be combative. Behaviour of the applicant(s) or those they have instructed has intimidated some people. This greatly concerns me

In Conclusion

- **There is no need for the proposed mineral operation**
- **There is no need for a waste operation**
- **The isolated rural location would not be suitable for a waste operation**
- **The impact on the rural road network would be recklessly dangerous**
- **The social and human cost to the surrounding communities caused by the industrialisation of Pallinghurst Woods would be devastating**

I urge WSCC officers and Planning Committee members to refuse the planning application

Martin Loxton