

From: piaellis@netscape.net
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: (WSCC/011/21)
Date: 26 April 2021 19:43:40

Dear Sirs,

I would like to once again object to the proposal of a new incinerator at Ford for the following reasons.

The application is pretty much the same with a slightly reduced footprint. I therefore believe that all of the points made by the many objectors to the previous submission hold equally to this one and should therefore be considered as relevant.

1. Location:

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.

We also have the proposed 1500 home residential site planned for the Ford Airfield which is immediately adjacent to the Incinerator site. This is contrary to WHO guidelines. Thus the whole surrounding area may be characterised as semi rural, though the new airfield development 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 (see next point) 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!

2. Scale and height of buildings:

There are no other buildings of a comparable size for miles around. At present the main features on the wider landscape are the gas storage tanks at Littlehampton and the Kingmere block of flats, also at Littlehampton which is about the same height as the proposed processing building. Many people regard that as a regrettable 'blot on the landscape' and a big planning mistake!

3. Traffic movements and access roads:

Traffic volumes: The application estimates the lorry numbers to be about 240 hgvs a day, but I understand that this is the same figure as that 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 a narrow, unclassified, country road. In addition there would be the ordinary vehicle movement of staff (40 people on 4 shifts per day) and the visitors which might include coaches for schoolchildren or other visitor groups. 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 applicant says that they will use much larger lorries to keep the vehicle numbers down but it must be questionable whether they can actually control the size of all the incoming vehicles, and in any event, who would want even larger lorries on what are essentially

country lanes? These lorries are a nightmare already and we don't need bigger ones!!!

4. Road access:

The only road access suggested by the applicant (or indeed possible) is via the A259 and Church Lane./Ford Road. They make no proposals whatsoever to improve the local road infrastructure apart from improving the junction of their plant access road onto Ford Road.

Ford road/Church Lane is a single lane 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.

Church Lane currently has a single, narrow footpath only on the east side and no crossing facilities at all. When large commercial vehicles pass close by a pedestrian there is a frightening suction effect which makes it feel very unsafe and you get covered in a spray from the disgusting contents from within these vehicles!!!!. Cyclists also use the footpath as the narrow carriageway is not safe for them.

Then we have the dangerous junction of Church Lane with Horsemere Green Lane which is frequently used as a cut through by traffic going to the Rudford Estate and also by drivers wishing to avoid the dangerous junction at the Oyster Catcher. This junction is considered dangerous because of its poor visibility in either direction for vehicles emerging from HGL, combined with the potential speed of traffic on Church Lane. Most collisions that occur here are 'damage only' so are not recorded on official statistic, but there are plenty of them.

5. Potential environmental impact:

It is widely recognised that the incineration of all kinds of commercial waste produces a range of noxious gases and also highly toxic dioxins. Large quantities of plastics go to incineration and produce some very toxic emissions.

"Incineration should be a method of 'last resort' as it has become one of the dirtiest ways of creating new energy."

Conclusion:

I think it clear that this vast new waste incinerator is totally unsuited to the location the its promoters have chosen for it. This is why I and so many others are objecting strongly to it.

Regards

Mrs L P Ellis



BN17 5RY
Piaellis@netscape.net