## Comment for planning application WSCC/036/20

Address BRAEMAR, WORTHING ROAD, WORTHING ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 6JN   Type of Comment Objection   Comments First of all with the mass of technical documents associated with this application the timescale for consultation is too short. Ideally with a proposal of this size and causing so much concern there should be an advocate employed to represent local residents both in analysing the documentation and presenting concerns. My objections at this stage are as follows. The threat to the ability of Arun District Council to maintain its five year housing land supply. Neighbouring the application site is a proposed development of 1500 houses and associated facilities which is a key strategic site in the Local Plan. Unusually it has been persued remarkably collaboratively with local residents. It seems highly unlikly that if this proposal is permitted, with the concerns abour size, scale, pollution, health risks and transport issues that the development could proceed. Secondly, there appears to be a clear correlation demonstrated that those Councils that use incineration see a fall in recycling rates, which demonstrated that the clumate change. In fact I believe that the incineration of plastic produces a far far higher carbon emmission in the production of energy than coal. Incineration is a barrier to the goal of a circular economy which is the only truly sustainable way to proceed given the demands on the earths natural resources and threat from emissions. I had not appreciated the huge increase in the size of the development from that previously permitted and there needs to be a very carful look at the impact of that on the South Down National Park and the historic town of Arundel. There appears to have not been enough studies on the health impact of persistent organic pollutants emitted on local populations, local farms and rivers, however some studies suggest increases in	Application number Name	WSCC/036/20 Derrick Chester
Comment First of all with the mass of technical documents associated with this application the timescale for consultation is too short. Ideally with a proposal of this size and causing so much concern there should be an advocate employed to represent local residents both in analysing the documentation and presenting concerns. My objections at this stage are as follows. The threat to the ability of Arun District Council to maintain its five year housing land supply. Neighbouring the application site is a proposed development of 1500 houses and associated facilities which is a key strategic site in the Local Plan. Unusually it has been persued remarkably collaboratively with local residents. It seems highly unlikly that if this proposal is permitted, with the concerns abour size, scale, pollution, health risks and transport issues that the development could proceed. Secondly, there appears to be a clear correlation demonstrated that those Councils that use incineration see a fall in recycling rates, which demonstrates that the proposal is contrary to a sustainable policy on waste and recycling and contrary to the ambition to tackle climate change. In fact I believe that the incineration of plastic produces a far far higher carbon emmission in the production of energy than coal. Incineration is a barrier to the goal of a circular economy which is the only truly sustainable way to proceed given the demands on the earths natural resources and threat from emissions. I had not appreciated the huge increase in the size of the development from that previously permitted and there needs to be a very careful look at the impact of that on the South Down National Park and the historic town of Arundel. There appears to have not been enough studies on the health impact of persistent organic pollutants emitted on local populations, local farms and rivers, however some studies suggest increases in asthma have been caused. It seems fairly clear, that when there are clear alternatives, pumping out this stuff wi	Address	BRAEMAR, WORTHING ROAD, WORTHING ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 6JN
consultation is too short. Ideally with a proposal of this size and causing so much concern there should be an advocate employed to represent local residents both in analysing the documentation and presenting concerns. My objections at this stage are as follows. The threat to the ability of Arun District Council to maintain its five year housing land supply. Neighbouring the application site is a proposed development of 1500 houses and associated facilities which is a key strategic site in the Local Plan. Unusually it has been persued remarkably collaboratively with local residents. It seems highly unlikly that if this proposal is permitted, with the concerns abour size, scale, pollution, health risks and transport issues that the development could proceed. Secondly, there appears to be a clear correlation demonstrated that those Councils that use incineration see a fall in recycling rates, which demonstrates that the proposal is contrary to a sustainable policy on waste and recycling and contrary to the ambition to tackle climate change. In fact I believe that the incineration is a barrier to the goal of a circular economy which is the only truly sustainable way to proceed given the demands on the earths natural resources and threat from emissions. I had not appreciated the huge increase in the size of the development from that previously permitted and there needs to be a very careful look at the impact of that on the South Down National Park and the historic town of Arundel. There appears to have not been enough studies on the health impact of persistent organic pollutants emitted on local populations, local farms and rivers, however some studies suggest increases in asthma have been caused. It seems fairly clear, that when there are clear alternatives, pumping out this stuff will have a detrimental impact of some degree, not to mention the processing and disposal of the ash created. IB/07/2020 01:53:57		Objection
10/07/2020 01:55:57	Comments	consultation is too short. Ideally with a proposal of this size and causing so much concern there should be an advocate employed to represent local residents both in analysing the documentation and presenting concerns. My objections at this stage are as follows. The threat to the ability of Arun District Council to maintain its five year housing land supply. Neighbouring the application site is a proposed development of 1500 houses and associated facilities which is a key strategic site in the Local Plan. Unusually it has been persued remarkably collaboratively with local residents. It seems highly unlikly that if this proposal is permitted, with the concerns abour size, scale, pollution, health risks and transport issues that the development could proceed. Secondly, there appears to be a clear correlation demonstrated that those Councils that use incineration see a fall in recycling rates, which demonstrates that the proposal is contrary to a sustainable policy on waste and recycling and contrary to the ambition to tackle climate change. In fact I believe that the incineration of plastic produces a far far higher carbon emmission in the production of energy than coal. Incineration is a barrier to the goal of a circular economy which is the only truly sustainable way to proceed given the demands on the earths natural resources and threat from emissions. I had not appreciated the huge increase in the size of the development from that previously permitted and there needs to be a very careful look at the impact of that on the South Down National Park and the historic town of Arundel. There appears to have not been enough studies on the health impact of persistent organic pollutants emitted on local populations, local farms and rivers, however some studies suggest increases in asthma have been caused. It seems fairly clear, that when there are clear alternatives, pumping out this stuff will have a
Attachments	Received	18/07/2020 01:53:57
	Attachments	