

Sue Bennett
Hollytree Lodge
Oak Grove
Loxwood
RH14 ODN

Date 7th February 2022

Dear Sirs

Re: Application No: WSCC/030/21

Letter of OBJECTION

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

I am writing to submit a further objection in relation to the above application and specifically to respond to the applicants second submission of documents to support their application for a landfill waste site. In my opinion there is nothing new in the volume of information submitted that gives any further clarity to their plans. My original objection letter remains.

I am concerned to read the applicants comments about members of society opposing this application and specifically those who do not live in the locality. I would like to raise with the planning committee the fact that any member of society wherever they live have a right to comment on a planning application. This type of tactic by the applicant leaves me with concern.

Need for clay

The applicant still has not demonstrated any evidence to support the need for clay. The inclusion of a sales brochure from a brick making company is totally irrelevant and should be disregarded.

A suggestion they could build their own brick factory is irrelevant and is just in my opinion a vague comment, without any substance to support this.

I have no doubt the applicants aim in suggesting they will remove clay is simply so that they have a hole they can then fill with commercial landfill waste. Therefore, the application should be seen as such.

The applicants discuss this project will bring commercial benefit to the local area. Again, there is no evidence to support this. I suspect the only commercial gains or benefit will be the applicants and the companies that benefit from the profit made in industrial landfill waste .

Public right of way

I am aware the applicants have withdrawn their proposal to temporarily close the public foot path FP79-1. In their original application they stated "a temporary closure of 33 years was necessary for public safety and security."

Although this aspect of the application has been withdrawn, there is no evidence of any new plan in place to ensure “public safety and security “.

Construction of a commercial/industrial waste sorting building in the middle of a tranquil established woodland is wrong for many reasons . This does not meet any requirements under any policies or guidelines, as stated in my previous objection letter.

The applicant mentions use of automatic gates. I question how these would be powdered in peaceful tranquil location without mains power ? To me this is another statement without any credibility or facts to support it. To install power to access the proposed site would involve significant work and will be of detriment to the natural environment.

Should such a building be constructed on this site, this would incur significant noise pollution, both in machinery required to operate the site, vehicles in and out, generator power for the building (there is no power) HGV's in and out of the site all day, staff vehicles to access the site and the general noise of commercial/industrial waste being sorted. There will be dust pollution. The use of lighting would impact on the environment as this is a woodland with no light pollution at all. All of this would have a negative impact on the environment, wildlife in the woodland including protected species, and members of the public who use the area.

What is not clarified by the applicants is their plan to secure the building or commercial site. The proposal is a huge commercial/industrial 15,000 sq ft building, in the middle of a woodland . Simply, this would visually be totally out of character in such an environment. I do question the reason for this location ?

There will be huge extraction pit dug out and no plans are in place to evidence how they will ensure that the public and wildlife would be safe and protected from huge open pits. As a regular user of this area, I know how wet this becomes during the winter months and during rainfall and water is likely to gather in these.

Recently there has been woodland maintenance work undertaken involving a few tractors and logging machines. As a result of this some of the footpaths are now impassable due to the damage created by the few vehicle movements on the soft, wet clay spoil. In each area maintenance has been completed there are huge ditches, and evidence of severely damaged verges, damage to plants and in some areas surface water that has not drained away. I cannot imagine the impact on the woodland if HGV's were to access the area on a daily basis. The sheer volume and weight of HGV's would completely destroy the area.

I would assume the applicants would need to construct fencing around their commercial working site. There is no detail of this. Any type of fencing that would be secure and safe for a commercial/ industrial building will have a significant visual impact on users of the woodland and wildlife that are in the area.

The applicant has no use for the clay/soil they will dig out. They will need to store this somewhere and obviously this will be a huge volume of soil. Again, there is no evidence in their application what they will do with this.

Highways and road safety

I am aware of the independent transport report, and I am very concerned as it appears the applicants have significantly under stated the number of HGV vehicles that would need to be in use daily to complete their proposed workload perhaps an increase from 42 a day to 70+ per day. This is a significant increase and should not be ignored.

This equates to c21,000 HGV movements per annum. It cannot be stressed too highly this is a rural location and an area totally unsuitable for such heavy-duty vehicles and a commercial landfill site.

In the woodland the proposed access route, is a track which is constructed for woodland maintenance and occasional tractor type use, and clearly not constructed to support regular, daily, continual HGV use.

The applicants have not commented on this, perhaps for a reason, however it is clear they will need to construct a road through the woodland to support both the volume and weight of HGV traffic. This would have a further impact both visually and environmentally on the area.

There are many footpaths in the woodland that cross their proposed access route and the applicants have not stated how they will protect walkers, animals, wildlife, runners, cyclists from the ongoing daily HGV use, again 70 + per day. I have no doubt should this go ahead there will be fatalities and injuries.

In my first objection letter in relation to this application I raised concern that the rural road from the site exit up to Rudgwick is not suitable for continual HGV traffic . My concern remains and is now increased .

If the volume of HGV traffic is to increase there is significant risk to public safety for road users, horse riders, walkers and cyclist and the risk to those is now increased. School buses use this road, there are no footpaths, and it is clear HGV's driving along the road would be dangerous.

I am concerned if there are 70 + HGV's using the rural road daily, the drivers will be driving through local villages to access the site. This will have significant safety implications. There will be no way of managing this significant and heavy goods vehicle use to the detriment of the local community and their safety .

Lay-by/ Bridleway

Again, there is no detail on how the applicants propose to ensure safety of horse riders and members of the public using the bridleway when there are 70+ daily HGV movements.

Wheel wash

The applicants propose to site the HGV wheel wash adjacent to an ancient woodland. The applicant has not evidence how this meets the requirements of water neutrality.

Facilities for staff

I understand the applicant proposes for a car park to be built for the staff near to the entrance to the woodland and then will use shuttle buses to take staff to and from the car park to their proposed building . Again, this is increased traffic both to the site and then a shuttle bus running alongside

HGV's. Equally I note The applicant plans to use bottled water for the staff and for toilet facilities as there is no main water. To me this does not present as environmentally friendly and does not meet the requirements of water neutrality.

In conclusion I again confirm my strongest possible **OBJECTION to this application**

Sue Bennett