

## **Letter of Objection.**

Application No: WSCC/030/21 Loxwood Clay Pits Limited : Clay quarry and construction materials recycling facility, Pallinghurst Woods, Loxwood Road, Loxwood, West Sussex RH14 0RW.

From: Mrs Alison Sleeman. Ivyhurst, Loxwood Rd, Loxwood RH14 0RW.

I would like to reaffirm my vehement objection to the above. The application does not address the fundamental flaws of the original and seems more intent on trying to besmirch the work of a local councillor and criticising WSCC policies with which it disagrees.

### **Clay**

The application still does not prove a demand for brick making clay. Proposing a future hand-made brickworks in an unknown location does not in my opinion create a demand. Weinerberger locally already has an established and presumably niche market for architectural bespoke bricks and tiles using moulds perfected over decades.

### **There are no detailed plans for:**

1. How electric gates on the bridle way/PROW 795 will be powered, be safe, not create noise pollution, affect day-to-day farming requirements.
2. How any plans to alter path conditions or erect gates can go-ahead on land owned by the Harrison family not the applicant.
3. How PROW 792-1 is going to be safe for users so near an industrial facility when previously it was argued it should be closed for security reasons.
4. How the lay-by will be reconstructed nor justification for removal of 9 beautiful flowering trees all on land not owned by the applicant. Visibility will still be poor and below recommended levels for traffic safety.
5. How HGV tipper trucks can be guaranteed not to shed detritus on the road and cause a danger to traffic. Only today I retrieved a log from the middle of the road which I can only presume fell off a timber lorry exiting the applicant's land (photos attached of mud tracks leading to log).

6. How Highway Code pedestrian/cycle priority and passing distances can be maintained when HGVs and people are using the same path.
7. The size and feasibility of the wheel wash area, its ability to conform to water neutrality directives nor the justification for the area including car parking and electric vehicle charging, all in ancient woodland.
8. How biodiversity will be protected across the entire site. For instance, minimal bat surveys on specific trees close to the site do not take into account far wider foraging ranges.

### **Right to object/environmental protection.**

Overall, the additions to the application seem to focus on trying to reduce objection numbers by arguing that only those living in West Sussex have a right to object. This is nonsense.

Public rights of way are public, to be used by anyone, regardless of where they live, to enjoy the surrounding area. Walkers, riders and cyclists come from miles to West Sussex to enjoy the peace and tranquillity of the woodland, to nature watch and unwind. It is not a postcode lottery of who has a right to complain or not. Anyone opposed to industrialising woodland has a right to voice their objection and a moral obligation to do so seeming as habitat loss has contributed to a decline of biodiversity in the UK of over 40% since 1970.

I strongly urge WSCC to reject this application.



