

Comment for planning application WSCC/036/20

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Application number | WSCC/036/20 |
| Name | Edward Hodgson |
| Address | ATHERINGTON HOUSE, FORD LANE, FORD LANE, ARUNDEL, BN18 0DE |
| Type of Comment | Objection |
| Comments | <p>I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed 'Ford energy from waste' proposal by Grundon/Viridor (ref WSCC/036/20). There are a number of reasons why this proposal is wholly unsuitable Failure to comply with Ford Neighbourhood Plan. This plan was worked up with great care over 8 years and was approved by the Government Inspector and West Sussex County Council raised no objections to the plan. The proposed Incinerator development does not comply with the Plan and with 1500 homes, a new school and community buildings being built on Ford Airfield this proposed incinerator is wholly inappropriate and planning for it should be refused Failure to protect the surrounding landscape. The sheer size of the proposed, oversized, building in the application will have a major adverse impact on the surrounding area. It is notable that the proposed building will dwarf any other buildings within this part of West Sussex and will be taller than Arundel Cathedral, Chichester Cathedral and the Kingmere Apartment tower block building in Littlehampton. Due to its size this proposed incinerator would dominate not only the immediate area but a much wider part of West Sussex. The Ford area retains much of its rural beauty and landscape and there are a number of listed buildings within view of the proposed development. Great care has been taken in the Ford Neighbourhood Plan to protect that landscape whilst accommodating an increased requirement for new homes. This application would destroy that landscape and severely impact other aspects such as the abundant wildlife that flourishes in the area. I fail to see how the proposed incinerator development could ever be considered appropriate for the area and it would also have a major impact on the South Downs National Park by compromising the conservation of views out of the Park - the scale of the incinerator buildings will be clearly visible from the Park and in no way could be regarded as conserving the Park's views. Adverse Impact on Human Health. Incineration releases, inter-alia, Fine Particulate Matter, which has the most impact on human health. The proposal to incinerate 275,000 tonnes of waste I believe breaches the Government Environmental Bill and incineration produces more CO2 emissions than even standard landfill. Given the Governments stated objective to move to a net zero Carbon economy I fail to see how approving this application will be consistent with that stated Government policy and it strikes me that the Grundon application is seeking to gain approval just months before the Environmental Bill becomes law. Given the high public health risk, at the very least the application should be suspended until the Environmental Bill becomes law. There are far more environmentally friendly ways to generate electricity, such as offshore windfarms. The application fails to comply with a number of Planning Policies. As well as failing to comply with the Ford Neighbourhood Plan (and other surrounding Neighbourhood Plans) this application fails to comply with several aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework, such as para.148 on the transition to a low carbon future and para.172 on conserving and enhancing the landscape. I understand that it also fails to comply with Policies EH2, EE1, EE10, the SDNP H1.11 to name but a few. Pressure on Local Road Network. The proposal for 120+ deliveries by lorry each day will place an intolerable pressure on the local road network and compromise highway safety further as well as worsening the quality of life and environment for all those living and working in the Ford, Yapton & Walberton area. Given that the number living in the immediate area is set to rise significantly, how can the application for such an oversized incinerator development be approved. This application is wholly inappropriate and I formally object to it.</p> |
| Received | 09/08/2020 13:10:35 |
| Attachments | |