

Additional comments for Item 7(a) – Lime Yard, West Grimstead

Additional comments from previous objector to specific points in the committee report:-

- The current site is an agricultural use and the proposed use is not an agricultural enterprise
- Considers that the fall back position from the existing use is limited due to the scaled back nature of the current use there. The previous appeal decision looked at this issue too.
- Considers that the use of the site has not been operational for 22 months therefore Condition 1 of 19/10383/VAR should come into play – ie the site be restored.
- The applicants' current operation in New Milton is part of a larger sand and gravel quarry, so not comparable with the proposed site.
- The New Milton site is about 30 miles away and therefore there will be an environmental impact of the increased traffic between the two sites.
- Suggests that vehicles frequently ignore weight restrictions
- What is there to stop the level of lorry movements to and from the site increasing once the consent is granted?
- No mention of other sorts of vehicles using the site, other than the HGVs
- The Planning committee and Inspector disagreed with the highways officer on the previous application and those comments still apply
- The working hours are unacceptable in such a quiet area, but agrees that being able to add restrictions such as hours of operation to the site is beneficial.
- Still considers that the operation of the site will be noisy and will have an impact on the surrounding area
- There are significant numbers of bats in the area which will be affected by the development, especially by any lighting.
- The current chalk heaps can be seen through the trees from the west
- New employees will have to arrive at the site by car, which is not sustainable
- The dust management proposals are of concern
- The development does not comply with para 83b of the NPPF or all of the points of policy E19