

Jane Moseley

From: Peter Catchpole [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 March 2019 21:38
To: helen.skinner@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: Rosemary Couchman ([REDACTED])
[REDACTED] Wealden Brickworks,
Langhurstwood Road, Horsham RH12 4QD.
Attachments: Planning Inspector Submission for Appeal.docx

Please find attached my comments regarding the appeal being heard by the Planning Inspectorate about the proposed incinerator in Horsham

Best Wishes

Peter Catchpole

WSC Councillor Holbrook

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Britaniacrest Incinerator Application

Appeal Reference APP/P3800/W/18/3218965

1) Introduction

Over the past two years there have been 2 x consultations regarding this incinerator application.

The residents of North Horsham have worked hard to ensure we had the highest response I have known to a proposed development in our area.

Rightly people are concerned about their future wellbeing and that of future generations if the incinerator comes to this area and the wholesale change of character that would be brought to our market town. It would be out of keeping with its surroundings, the massive structure would overwhelm existing buildings in the surrounding area and would have significant adverse impact on views.

The scale form and design including landscaping would not integrate with nor enhance adjoining land uses as Policy W11 and W12 require.

That is why over 5,500 people rejected these plans:

1167 objection More than in the first round of planning in 2017

Over 4500 signed a petition saying NO to having an incinerator in North Horsham

This overwhelming NO vote is democracy at work and should be given the weight it deserves and fully respected.

2) Horsham has done its bit for WS Residents on Waste

Over a number of decades Horsham has been taking the burden of waste disposal for all West Sussex residents. From a waste perspective Horsham has been consuming the smoke of West Sussex Residents, what is not now acceptable is consuming the smoke of everyone else's Commercial and Industrial Waste in SE England through this market driven incinerator development, that is not linked to any WSCC or other public sector service contract.

3)i) Is this facility a Recovery vs. Disposal plant?

Of great concern to local people is that the developer has submitted an application for a 3Rs facility which is suggestive of "recovery" (80%) in terms of the waste hierarchy, but analysis performed by both UKWIN and local residents with relevant expertise is that this application will be unable to meet the strict criteria for recovery or R1 status and as a result should be treated as a disposal application. Disposal waste processing is in line with landfilling activities and therefore right at the bottom of the waste hierarchy. This is the least desirable and least sustainable/ environmentally friendly option for dealing with West Sussex waste.

If the application is being decided on the basis that the proposal will be an R1 Recovery facility then I believe it is necessary to impose a R1 Planning Condition as West Sussex CC did for application WSCC/096/13/F for Grundon's Circular Technology Park proposal in order to ensure that the proposal would move waste up the waste hierarchy and to ensure compliance with Policy W10 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan.

This key point has been made by a number of other commentators and must be addressed. WSCC did not make this condition as we think it should and it cannot be the position to expect the Environment Agency to verify this status after the event.

I see the “recovery” vs. “disposal” is a material planning consideration which has failed to be addressed by the WSCC planning report.

ii) Importing Waste from across SE England

Another point of concern for residents is the need to bring in 230,000 tonnes of C & I waste per annum to Horsham. Although West Sussex report there is an estimated 950,000 tonnes per annum of shortfall in West Sussex for C&I, if you deduct the material which cannot be burned, material that could be recycled, reused, it is estimated this would leave only 89,000 tonnes per annum. By permitting this particular development with a capacity for the equivalent of 2 counties worth of waste to be burned will not only be in contravention with WSCC Waste Local Plan (which is all about only addressing West Sussex's needs in a sustainable way) but will also encourage cross boundary waste movements from the Southern Counties and further afield which the applicant has referenced. With this being a purely privately owned and run incinerator, there is no guarantee West Sussex's needs will be met as the driver will be market forces rather than local needs for a sustainable solution to waste processing.

iii) Air Quality Measures

There is insufficient consideration given to air quality and the evidence put forward by the applicant. It has been noted by expert opinion that key calculations are wrong and in-particular for CO₂ and NO₂. The calculations which suggest a lowering of carbon in comparison with landfill are seen as inaccurate by virtue of their calculations being incorrect by a magnitude of 1000x. The correct calculation, based on government guidelines, suggests this incinerator is worse than landfilling. The NO₂ calculations again are seen as incorrect. The permission being relied on to discount the vehicle impact of the incinerator from 2015, was permitted on out of date data (2013 data) and with little air quality data from the actual site/ area. There are parts close to Horsham which have Air Quality problems who will find it unacceptable to permit additional pollutants which could further add to the poor air quality which have not been considered at all Crawley being one such area. HDC has also indicated that it retains reservations over the impact of the proposed facility in terms of air quality.

An air quality monitoring station should be installed to monitor air quality prior to any permission to develop any incinerator

4) Pollution

a) On the current waste site we already have 4 x forms of pollution from:-

- The Brickworks
- Biffa WSCC Waste Operations (Mechanical & Biological Treatment Plant)
- Landfill gases
- HGV movements

This means that the area already has a cumulative level of emissions well above a zero base line coming from these sources and to this must now be added the new emissions from the incinerator

b) We know that road vehicles account for 80% of NOX at the roadside. We also know the North Horsham roads already have severe congestion and getting worse, with constant stop/start road motions leading to pollution hot spots. To this would be added more HGVs coming to the new incinerator from across SE England in order to supply a continuous source of Commercial and Industrial Waste in order to satisfy the requirements to keep the incinerator burning.

This beast will not be conforming to the proximity rule whereby the disposal of waste is made as close as possible to its source. Here waste will need to come in from all points of the compass to keep the fires burning 24/7.

Currently BCR are only using about 37% of the approved HGV allowance of 284 HGV movements per day. This incinerator will therefore see a massive increase in HGVs to this level at a time when the Government has set new standards about vehicle pollution in diesel engines.

Surely this is the right time for a thorough review of the safety of this level of HGV movement and the added pollution this will bring to this area of Horsham. This level of HGV activity was approved 5 years ago and thinking has moved on substantially since then.

Since this application NICE (The Health Watchdog) has reported that pollution should be addressed at the planning stage and urged Councils to use the planning system to cut people's exposure to polluted air, which is linked to a list of health problems including asthma attacks, reduced lung functions which will require expensive remedial action further down the line.

5) The Incinerator will impact on the character and distinctiveness of the area

The incinerator building is out of all proportion to the proposed site, which is too small, and the environs in which it will be sited.

At 170m x 107m and 12 stories or 36m tall and with a chimney stack 95m high with an added emission plume plus aviation lights these structures will be visible from a large number of beautiful viewpoints.

HDC have commented:

- that the height of the chimney stack in particular remains a concern and will be seen from afar. Not surprisingly, the additional representative viewpoints, only confirm that views of the stack will be generally available from close, medium and long range due to its height. The chimney stack would still be a significant physical feature in the landscape and wider countryside. They also indicate It is recognised that there will always be harm arising from the stack due to its size and impossibility to fully mitigate the effect of such a structure.
- Still has concerns about visual impact
- landscape impact and the potential impact on the North Horsham development

The design, height, scale and overall massing of this development will result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the wider landscape and character of the area.

It is not sympathetic with the landscape, open spaces, the skyline, which will be denuded of leaves for 6 months of each year, important rural views together with new ongoing night time light pollution.

WSSC Landscape Architect has commented that:

The scale of the proposed development is such that mitigation measures to screen the development only has limited effect

and Mole Valley said that:

'the sheer size of the facility means it would be visible from a wide range of surrounding viewpoints particularly the chimney stack.

Given the extensive visual impact of the development we asked that WSSC should undertake an independent landscape assessment to gauge the potential effect on the nationally significant landscape and the character of the rural area. This was not taken up.

This building is like having a gargantuan form of a Titanic x 3 dropping anchor in the middle of our rural community.

How this unwelcome guest that is totally out of keeping with its surroundings is now considered acceptable in terms of its impact on landscape and visual amenity is a complete mystery to everyone in the Horsham area.

6) 3 years of disruption to build then 30 years of burning

The incinerator, if built, will impact for 3 years in the lives of local people. Traffic disruption, noise dust. Little let up for them over this period with a further disruption to their lifestyles.

Then when built it will be with us for at least 30 years and no matter how they try and camouflage or reshape this colossus of a building it is still just an ugly oversized incinerator that does not fit onto its site nor in scale or tune with the local surroundings.

7) Ad Hoc Planning for Incinerators

There is a great danger that in leaving the way planning approvals for incinerators are dealt with on the current ad hoc basis, to market forces, that we will see the unintended consequences of an overcapacity for burning of waste happening rather than incentivising waste companies to invest in recycling technology. What we do not want is an overcapacity of burning, lack of investment in recycling and being stuck with huge ugly buildings, like this proposal, that we find out too late have no purpose but for commercial reasons, having £150m investment, are hungry to keep burning waste into the 050s and beyond. No doubt as signalled by the Government recently we will need a new incineration tax on waste to stop burning and make recycling the way for all to go.

8) Disruption to residents daily lives

Local residents raised many concerns in their objections to the WSSC Planning Committee about the impact this development could have on their day to day lives and those of so many families.

- Concerns about the risks of pollution and long term health

- Should the scheme proceed residents will see more HGV movements during construction and then once complete a continuous HGV activity : Some mitigation in the reduction in operating hours (WSCC Planning Report Appendix 1 Para 14 & 16) were suggested such as:

7.30 am to 18.00 Mon to Fri

8.00 am to 12 noon Saturdays and no Sundays or Bank Holiday operation

If the scheme were to go ahead then this could be effective for the construction period and then operational hours of use.

- Increase in noise at weekend and evening when families should be able to enjoy their leisure time without disruption. Some residents in Station Road Warnham live only 200m from the proposed incinerator site
- Light pollution from 24hr operation - High Weald Joint Advisory Committee requested that external lighting is controlled through conditions
- Risks arising from fire at the plant and transportation of waste such as incinerator bottom ash onto our local roads.

Public Health England make it explicit that the planning authority should:

- ensure that the applicant has plans in place to undertake air quality dispersion modelling to assess a larger number of receptors
- confirm that on-site procedures are sufficient to prevent any off-site emissions of incinerator bottom ash particles
- should consider the need for the applicant to develop an accident management plan
- identifies all the potential hazards in relation to all of the proposed operations
- assesses the risk associated with the hazards (e.g. fire) (including an assessment of the potential impact on human health, e.g. on local residents); and Identifies the measures to prevent or mitigate the risks.

All these safeguards should all be in place before any permission is granted.

9) Conclusion

With the new application last year to WSCC very little changed since the recommended rejection last time.

It is not considered acceptable for:

- Visual Impact on the landscape - It will be visible from a large number of viewpoints. The Incinerator will impact on the character and distinctiveness of the area.
- Out of keeping with the surroundings 170m x 107m x 36m high building plus 95m chimney stack
- There is clear guidance on what can be claimed to be recovery versus disposal as set out in the EU Directive 2008/98/EC, the Waste Framework Directive. This application cannot meet that criteria of 65% efficiency to meet the R1 status (as it will be in the region of 25%). It should instead be classed as D10- disposal in line with landfilling and the lowest part of the waste hierarchy.

- **"R1 status...will not be part of an environmental permit."** and goes further to state that: "The distinction between having R1 status or having a plant being classified as a disposal facility **is important for planning purposes...**". **The "recovery" vs. "disposal" is a material planning consideration which was not addressed by the WSCC planning report and should be within the Appeal Process**
- **Importing Waste from across SE England into Horsham with increased HGV activity across SE England**
- Key calculations for air quality are wrong in-particular for CO2 and NO2 and new guidance has now been received on air pollution and its impact.
- The impact on 2750 new homes and a school in the North Horsham Development
- Increased Noise for residents and light pollution
- Cumulative pollution levels
- Lack of recycling

This development is the wrong technology in the wrong place squeezed onto too small a site. Therefore, I ask Planning Inspector to reject this appeal.

Local people believe the benefits do not outweigh the local and environmental impact.

This development if approved will impact on many generations of people in Horsham over the next 30 years. It will negatively impact now on the lives of thousands of residents in North Horsham so please turn down this appeal and support the residents very real and cogently argued opposition to this development.

Peter Catchpole
 WS County Councillor Holbrook
 Northlands House
 Northlands Road
 Horsham RH125PW
 West Sussex
 1st March 2019