

## Letter of Objection

### **Application No: WSCC/030/21**

Loxwood Clay Pits: "Claypit quarry and construction materials recycling facility, Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood Road, Loxwood, West Sussex, RH14 0RW.

Letter of objection. From, Toby Sleeman, Ivyhurst, Loxwood Rd, Loxwood, West Sussex RH14 0RW.

### **Personal Statement.**

I live at Ivyhurst which is the house adjacent to the proposed entrance of the Loxwood Claypit (LCP) and commercial waste recycling facility. We have lived in the house for six years and in the area for 19 years. We object to this application on many levels and have a massive concern on the effect this proposal will have on our household and the households of our near neighbours and the local community.

Living in our house are myself, my Wife, our 18-year-old son and our 15-year-old son. Our 15-year-old son is severely Autistic, and my wife is his full-time carer. Our 15 year old son has never been able to access full-time education but has a combination of home schooling and out-reach educators. Many of his activities take place in our garden which is very close to the entrance and exit for the proposed site and would be closer still to the location of the staff car park and wheel wash. Our son suffers with acute anxiety and Hyperacusis which is a hearing disorder that makes normal everyday sounds unbearably loud and painful for him to hear. Obviously 42 lorry movements to the front and side of our house plus heavy machinery coming and going and the use of an extremely loud wheel wash within circa 20 meters of our house will render it impossible for our son to access his own garden and limit his access to education and recreational time.

One of the reasons we moved to our current house six years ago was for its secluded and quiet setting so our son could have the freedom to play and learn in peace and quiet. Our son also uses the footpaths through the woods on an almost daily basis with his carers or family and normally within the hours of business that the proposal lays out. He would struggle to safely negotiate the PROW's if he had to contend with heavy trucks, plant and machinery and certainly would not be able to cope with the associated risk, noise, mud and dust. Above all else, my objections to this application start and finish with my son's wellbeing.

### **Objections.**

1. **Site Entrance.** The entrance to the proposed site is not suitable. The layby (not owned by the applicant) is currently used by many local people to park up and use the PROW and the bridleways. From very early in the morning, throughout the day and into the early evening you will always see cars parked and people using the footpaths. Many elderly residents use it daily to meet up with their friends and there is a lovely community around this amenity.

2. **The Lay-by.** The applicant states that they would like to remodel the lay-by to make their access and egress easier. I strongly object to this. Currently the lay-by and the parcel of land is a very nice green space with mature trees. The applicant clearly understands that the current set up of the lay-by is not adequate or safe for them to carry out their proposed operations so would like to alter it. This however does not solve the issues of the community wishing to park there to access the PROW's.
3. **Access to PROW from the Lay-By.** The public will not be able to safely gain access to the PROW from the lay-by as the entrance to the proposed site is directly adjacent to the start of the PROW. The public cannot gain access without crossing the entrance and exit to the site and in doing so will be in danger from 42 lorry movements and associated heavy plant. Accident waiting to happen.
4. **Bridleway 3240.** The site access track crosses Bridleway 3240. How is this going to be managed safely? How will a horse rider control their horse faced with a large lorry? How will walkers and cyclists negotiate this junction safely? Nothing in the application details how this junction will be managed in terms of safety or rights of way. This is a very dangerous element of the application that should not be overlooked.
5. **Footpath 795.** The applicant states that footpath 795 runs parallel with the access track. In my opinion this is not the case and talking with older residents who have walked the footpath for 30 years plus this has never been the case. Footpath 795 uses the entire width of the track. That being so, how would the applicant manage the public access along footpath 795? They don't own that stretch of the access path and would not be able to maintain the structure of the path. Very quickly their lorry traffic would make this stretch impassable. On safety grounds and access grounds I object to them using footpath 795.
6. **Footpath 792-1.** The closure of footpath 792-1. My family and I use this footpath at least once a week. The applicant's intention to close this path for 33 years will effectively deprive us and the wider community of this amenity for a generation. I object to the closure of footpath 792-1
7. **Health and Safety.** Quarries are very dangerous places, within the application very little detail regarding site security and the safety of the public has been referenced. Having grown up in Cornwall surrounded by the waste land that Tin Mining and English China Clay extraction left, it was an a very regular occurrence for kids and teenagers to injure themselves, drown or fall into pits. As the applicant has little or no experience in either quarrying or waste management, I feel it highly likely that an event like this could occur.
8. **Road access to the site.** The applicant states that all site traffic will access the site via Loxwood Rd from the A281 at Bucks Green. How would they control this? If waste is coming from all over West Sussex surely the drivers would come the easiest route which more than likely will involve approaching the site from Loxwood as well. This seems to be an unworkable aspiration on the part of the applicant. Loxwood Rd

through to the A281 is highly unsuitable for heavy goods traffic. The road is far too narrow (less than 5.1 metres at points), in extremely poor condition, prone to severe flooding and black ice in the winter. Using the road every day, I have followed many HGV's along this route. The majority of HGV's are unable to stay on their side of the road and due to the poor condition of the road's outer edges they mostly choose to drive down the centre. It is extremely difficult for two HGV's to pass going in opposite directions and in many cases have to come to a complete stop to achieve the pass. The road also has a very high level of cycle and equestrian traffic at all times, and I fear for the safety of these road users.

9. **Wheel wash.** The need for a wheel wash is mentioned within the application though no specific plans are given to exactly where it will be sited other than its most suitable location near the entrance at the lay-by. Wheel washes are huge pieces of equipment that need a lot of power and water. They also need a lagoon to collect the wastewater and settle the sediment collected from the washing process. These lagoons need to be dug out on a very regular basis for them to be effective. The noise from a wheel wash would be unacceptable to us as the closest residence and to our neighbours across the road. Also the wheel wash would be situated next to a bridleway and public footpath so potentially could scare passing horse traffic. The area they say they intend to site this piece of equipment sits within ancient woodland.
10. **Noise pollution.** Other than my fears for my sons' condition regarding noise there are many other elements to consider. Skip lorries and tipper lorries make a huge amount of noise negotiating bumpy track. Skip chains bang the side of skips, reversing warning sirens, diesel engines. On the quarry and recycling facility the noise from excavators and bull dozers will create a low bass noise that will travel for miles. This will destroy the peace and tranquillity of the whole area. As the site has no power the site will rely upon diesel powered generators which again will add more noise pollution to what is an extremely quiet and peaceful area. Due to the situation of our house if the application were successful, we will have at least 42 lorry movements along the road in front of the house and also to the side of our house within 20 to 25 metres. Add to this a very noisy wheel wash and the noise will become unbearable.
11. **Dust and Air Pollution.** I am extremely worried about the levels of dust and other airborne pollution. As previously stated, our property is within 20-25 metres of the proposed entrance and access track to the site. 42 Lorry movements a day will kick up colossal amounts of dust from the unmade track and blow directly into our garden. This will make it impossible for us to hang our washing on the line or to use our garden. Add to this diesel fumes from the lorries and our outside spaces will be completely unusable. On the Quarry site itself there will be massive amounts of dust in the air and the prevailing wind will blow it towards Rykkyo School and Tismans Common. All the site plant and machinery would need to run from diesel engines which again is going to pollute a pristine environment and make it extremely unpleasant for people who are using the PROWS and the wildlife.
12. **Light Pollution.** The applicant plans to have lighting at both the recycling and waste management facility and lighting at the car park that will illuminate our property where

currently we have dark skies and in so doing so add to our disturbance. Lighting at the recycling and waste management will cause a massive amount of light pollution. Ironically no plan has been submitted to light areas where the access track meets and crosses the PROW's adding an extra element of danger. A lot of dog walkers use the PROW's in the hours of darkness of the winter months.

13. **Suitability of the site.** According to National policy this type of Waste recycling development operation should not be situated on a Greenfield site but should be situated within Brownfield or indeed a built-up area. I cannot see any merit in having lorries carrying out what is nearly a two-mile round trip (in and out of the site) through unspoiled woodland. The track itself will degrade very quickly, they will need to replace and reconfigure a bridge causing untold amounts damage to the riverbank and disturbance to the local wildlife. Reading the Chichester District Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2019 I feel this proposal contravenes policies 25, 40, 45, 48, 49.
14. **Need for Clay.** WCSS state in their most recent Minerals Monitoring report that there is no demand for more clay and that they have ample reserves and have access to a 25-year supply. There are at least three local claypits two of which have a 25 year supply and one with at least a 24 year supply. This application states it will transport clay but does not specify where it will be transported to. None of the local brickmakers need more clay as they have ample stocks of their own that don't come with associated transport costs as their clay is sourced on-site. In my opinion there is no local need for the clay and all the applicant wants is a hole to bury unrecycled building waste in.
15. **Damage to the environment and Ecology.** The damage to the woodland and local wildlife species would be devastating. We have an enormous amount of bats living in and around our house that will be very much disturbed by the noise, dust and in particular the floodlighting of the car park area. We often see slow worms in and around our garden so I imagine they are also inhabiting Pephurst woods also. Placing a wheel wash and car park into an area designated as Ancient woodland would cause untold damage to the trees and woodland floor. There is an active badger set very close to the proposed car-park/wheel wash and access road. Mature trees and their root structures will be badly damaged by the huge amounts of HGV's driving over them on their way to and from the site. The site will produce or be responsible for an enormous increase in net carbon emissions from diesel powered lorries, plant and generators which will have a terrible effect on a lovely green space.

In conclusion, I have looked at this application and tried very hard to be objective. I could find nothing within it that had any merit. A claypit that is not needed other than to produce a void in which to bury unrecyclable waste. The site is too far away from the lorry network and situated within an idyllic greenfield space and forest. The roads are not suitable to safely handle this amount of HGV traffic, it will not benefit the local area or community, it would deprive the community of some of the nicest footpaths and bridleways in the area. I object to this application.

Toby Sleeman 22-08-2021

