

# Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Lesley Lovell"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="8, THE HAMLETS, WATERFORD GARDENS, CLYMPING, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 5RY"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="I object strongly to this revised application and at its cynical attempt to reduce numbers of objections to the previous application. (Many people who do not understand how planning works will think that their previous objection will be carried over to this slightly revised proposal as it should be ...but won't) My objections are as follows 1. Increased HGV movements estimated at c. 400 PER DAY along Church Lane. 2. Hundreds of HGV movements from across vast areas of the South of England along unclassified and crumbling country roads with poorly designed junctions and accident black spots (E.g. Oystercatcher on A259, Church Lane/A259, Horsemere Green Lane/Church Lane) 3. The Transportation of waste in huge HGVs from far afield through country roads and villages with little pedestrian footpath protection. 4.The siting of an incinerator close to 1500 proposed new homes and hundreds of existing village homes, schools and farmland is in direct contravention of WHO guidelines. 5. Size of proposed building has been slightly reduced but is still out of keeping with the locality at about 13 stories high and it now has twin 85 metre chimneys instead of the single one shown in the first proposal. It will be visible for miles around, especially from the South Downs National Park and the coast. 6. There are no offers from the developers to upgrade the local infrastructure to cope with the massive HGV load on our roads, no paid for link to A27, no improvement to local junctions, apart from their own access, no improvement to local footpaths., nothing towards rebuilding the local roads that their HGVs will tear up! Nothing but an arrogant assumption that it will not affect the local environment at all! 7. There is a strong movement against such energy from waste plants as the figures used to promote them are fundamentally flawed. They are the most polluting form of energy provision after burning coal and as such are outdated technology. The council must REFUSE this application as it is not in the public interest but merely a get rich quick exercise on behalf of the developers. I understand that local Parish Councils and Arun District Council are also objecting to the development."/>
Received	<input type="text" value="16/04/2021 14:17:17"/>
Attachments	