

Comment for planning application WSCC/036/20

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/036/20"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Janet Smith"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="MALTRAVERS STREET, 15, MALTRAVERS STREET, ARUNDEL, BN18 9AP"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Comment"/>
Comments	<p>PROPOSED WASTE INCINERATOR AT FORD Planning Application WSCC/036/20 EFW Plant (Incinerator) at Ford by Grundon and Viridor - July 2020 Objection and comments from A.J. Lovell MSc. C.Eng, FICE FiHT (Retired) I object to this development and here are my reasons I have looked at the application and it is extremely complicated. I am concerned that most people will not have the time, energy or understanding to go through it in detail. This will possibly reduce the number of objections submitted, but bewildering the local residents into not responding should not be interpreted as a broad acceptance of the proposals by the local community. No action has been taken to implement the current planning approval given by WSCC in 2015 - why is this? Was it simply a 'trojan horse' application to establish the use of this site so that a far larger application could be made at a later date. The proposed site is surrounded by rural farming country with the relatively small villages of Climping, Yapton, Ford and the western fringes of Littlehampton close by and a small industrial estate. We have the proposed 1500 home residential site planned for the Ford Airfield which is immediately adjacent to the Incinerator site and I believe should be given preference. And surely you can't put an incinerator next to this many homes? The new building is such a size that it will be visible for many miles and will be the dominant feature in the views from the south downs national park, just as Arundel Castle and Cathedral are from the south at the moment. The quoted size of the main operational building is absolutely massive with a height similar to a 16 storey block of flats and the chimney similar to a 26 storey block of flats. There are no buildings of that height anywhere along the South Coast here and it would dominate the skyline hideously. There can be no doubt a building of this size will dominate the views of the whole area and totally change and damage the character of the whole surrounding area and all the villages within it. I live in Arundel and this would dominate views from my house. The application estimates the lorry numbers to be about 240 HGVs a day, but this is similar to the figure given when the earlier permission for a much smaller plant was granted. Using a scaling up from the earlier waste tonnage to the proposed 295000 tonnes per year (275000 + 20000 recycling) I would estimate that the daily number of lorries could well be much larger than the applicant's estimate of 240, to perhaps 400 hgvs each day onto an unclassified country road. In addition there would be the ordinary vehicle movement of staff (40 people on 4 shifts per day) All of this makes the operator's traffic estimates look very questionable and could make the traffic impact very much heavier than they claim. The only road access suggested by the applicant (or indeed possible) is via the A259 and Church Lane. They make no proposals whatsoever to improve the local road infrastructure apart from improving the junction of their plant access road onto Church Lane. Ford road/Church Lane is a road which runs through the heart of Climping providing the main local route for private cars, cyclist, pedestrians and cyclists to the local church, playing field, two community halls and the local school, and of course the wider area. The road currently has a 40mph speed limit which is constantly exceeded at off peak times (we have the speed monitoring figures to prove that with a maximum measured speed of an unbelievable 100mph recorded one afternoon). During the evening peak period the restricted capacity at the roundabout junction with A259 causes extensive southbound queuing in Church Lane which can extend as far back as Ford Prison and causes extensive delays and air pollution. When large vehicles pass close by a pedestrian there is a frightening suction effect which makes it feel very unsafe. Cyclists also use the footpath as the narrow carriageway is not safe for them. The unsuitability of the road as the main access to a new waste facility should be enough alone to justify a refusal. It is widely recognised that the incineration of all kinds of commercial waste produces a range of noxious gases and also highly toxic dioxins. The applicant stresses how their plant will have the latest technology to clean and filter out all of these things which are damaging to both humans and the environment they live in. BUT a 160 foot high chimney is required to try and get the emissions away from the surrounding area and make this true. Why would you put a plant like this so close to many residential areas? This massive new waste incinerator is totally unsuited to this location. I object strongly to this proposed plan.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="05/08/2020 10:14:37"/>
Attachments	