

From: [Emma Tristram](#)
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: WSCC/011/21
Date: 15 April 2021 07:04:48

I object to this planning application (WSCC/011/21) for the following reasons.

The application calls itself an 'energy recovery facility', but this is a euphemism. It is a waste burning plant, bringing waste from other counties. The MERF facility already on the site is a good way of recycling waste (I have seen round it). By linking the new waste burning plant to a new MERF the application attempts to whitewash the waste burning facility.

Objections I have seen have focused on the additional HGV traffic on unsuitable roads, the nearness to the new housing development and school at Ford, and the unsightly tall chimney in a rural area with heritage areas such as Arundel and the South Downs National Park nearby. These are good reasons to object, but no-one has pointed out that incineration is controversial because it produces carbon emissions and as such is contrary to the Paris Agreement. There is a current legal case by Georgia Elliott-Smith against the government claiming that the 'total emissions cap' under the UK Emissions Trading Scheme is set too high to meet 'short and medium term obligations under the Paris Agreement'. She also claims that it unlawfully omits 'municipal waste incineration emissions'.

The planning application claims that some of the output from the waste burning will be converted into materials for building, e.g. roads. But we need to stop building roads because they cause more traffic and this leads to more carbon emissions.

WSCC has a climate change policy and states on its website 'we need to ... reduce carbon emissions to mitigate the cause of climate change'. To be consistent with this statement, and for all the other reasons, please refuse this application.

Emma Tristram
Stable Cottage, Binsted, BN18 0LL



Emma Tristram



****PLEASE NOTE THIS IS MY NEW EMAIL ADDRESS, PLEASE UPDATE YOUR RECORDS ACCORDINGLY****