

# Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	WSCC/011/21
Name	Alan Silvester
Address	BEAGLE DRIVE, 6, BEAGLE DRIVE, ARUNDEL, BN18 0NY
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>This is a major application by anybody's standards and a very complicated application as demonstrated by the large number of papers submitted in support of the application. For this reason I suspect that with this "revised" application, the company are hoping that people will not spend the time again to go through it all in detail. This will work in the applicant's interest as it will undoubtedly reduce the number of objections submitted, but that should not be interpreted as a broad acceptance of the proposals by the local community, as seen by the large volume of objections made against the previous application. Yapton is a small village, already overloaded with building work, air dust pollution and poor supporting infrastructure. The traffic is overflowing and often at a stand-still as trucks, lorries and cars struggle to traverse the village. The junction onto the A259 cannot take any more traffic, it is causing too many problems now, never mind with the increase in heavy trucks. There is only one way into the site and the same way out, so this will be too much to cope with, adding to the already heavy traffic to and from the industrial site nearby. The local roads will not be able to cope with all the extra traffic, and drains already overflow after even moderate rainfall. The proposed site is surrounded by an area that is largely rural farming country with the relatively small villages of Climping, Yapton, Ford and the western fringes of Littlehampton close by. The existing Rudford Industrial Estate is quite small and has no major businesses, certainly nothing anything like the scale of what is now being proposed yet again. In addition, and significantly, we have a proposed 1500 home residential site development planned for the Ford Airfield which is immediately adjacent to the incinerator site. Thus the whole surrounding area may be characterised as semi rural, though the new airfield will change that to some extent. It is also adjacent to the South Downs Country Park and close to the historic town of Arundel. The new building is of such a size that it will be visible for many miles and will be the dominant feature in the views from the south downs, just as Arundel Castle and Cathedral are from the south at the moment. But what a hideous comparison that would be! Scale and height of buildings, especially the stack (chimney) 85 metres tall. This is about 263 feet tall or about the same as a 26 storey block of flats. They estimate that it will take around 5 years to construct it and there can be no doubt that a building of this size will dominate the views of the whole area which is currently unspoiled by anything tall, which helps to retain its rural character. The visual impact of this new building would totally change that and damage the character of the whole surrounding area and all the villages within it. An unsightly monstrosity. We should be encouraging recycling, not incineration. 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 gases which are damaging to both humans and the environment they live in. This maybe so or not so, but it is apparent that an 85 metre tall chimney is required to try and get the emissions away from the surrounding area. I suspect that wind changes could have quite an effect on that. And what would happen if there is a plant failure, maybe one that is not spotted straight away? Or if the monitoring is not quite up to scratch? Clearly there are further questions to be raised, all leading to the realisation of why would you put a plant like this so close to many residential areas? A disaster waiting to happen for people's health and the environment. Once again I implore you to conclude that this vast new waste incinerator is totally unsuited to the location that its promoters have chosen for it. This is why I am objecting strongly to it on what I believe are solid planning and environmental reasons. Any one of the above points ought to be enough for a rejection on their own, but when added together the logical decision must be for a rejection again. Surely the number of objections previously received are an indication of the strength of feeling against this incinerator. Please do not agree this application.</p>
Received	14/04/2021 13:30:34
Attachments	