From: [redacted]
To: PL Planning Applications
Subject: New comments for application WSCC/030/21
Date: 09 February 2022 19:55:56

New comments have been received for application WSCC/030/21 from Andy Leahy.

Comments:
I first commented on this application on 14th August 2021 and gave a detailed critique of why the application should be refused for valid planning reasons. Since then the applicant has submitted further information which albeit lengthy offers little or nothing to address the concerns I and others have raised.

I would confirm the following issues still remain the key reasons for the application to be refused as contravening Policy M5 of the WSCC Joint Minerals Local Plan:

1) This application is not for the supply of clay to a specified brickworks. The applicants make spurious references to the closure of other brickworks and the potential shortage of clay production in Surrey, but no contractual or confirmatory details have been supplied to identify any customer(s) for the clay. Therefore, the application does not meet the first criteria of policy M5.
2) The policy does allow for the extraction of clay for engineering purposes, but again no actual evidence of an end user has been provided.
3) The policy states that quarries and clay pits should be close to the end user of the minerals. This is not the case here and no specific use has been identified.
4) The fact that the site is located off a rural lane, 3.5km from the junction with the Lorry Route Network (A281 Bucks Green) makes it entirely unsuitable. Any HGV travelling on Loxwood Road has to straddle the centre line of the road thus endangering oncoming traffic. We have a video of this happening if the planning committee would like to see it.
5) The proposed access on to Loxwood Rd is un-safe and the minimum vision splay lengths have not been met in the proposed design.
6) Policy W8 requires first and foremost that "the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and where possible the wider area". The proposal cannot meet this test if there is no claypit to backfill. The land is currently used for forestry and supports a wide variety of Ancient Woodland, Veteran Trees, protected species, Flora and Fauna, thus any disruption caused by the creation of a CDEW facility on its own without the claypit as a reason to require land fill, cannot outweigh the harm done.
7) Policy W15 states that Heritage Assets should be preserved or enhanced. Loxwood Road has many Listed Buildings along its length, notably "Crabtree Cottage" at the corner of Drungewick Lane which is very close to the road. This building is Grade 2 listed and under the NPPF should be afforded protection from the effects of the development including the increased HGV traffic this development will generate.
8) Since the application was first submitted Natural England have issued an advisory note to Crawley, Horsham, Chichester Councils and West Sussex County Council that a water neutrality statement should be provided by all applicants. I cannot see such a report amongst the new information provided by the applicant and as NE advise in the absence of a satisfactory document planning consent should not be granted.

Please consider the above points alongside my more detailed comments in my letter of 14th August 2021.

Mr A.M.Leahy
Arundene Orchard
Loxwood Road
Rudgwick