

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="L Chapman"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="63 Copperfields Wycombe Bucks"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

Comments

To whom it may concern, We are moving to Climping soon, hence our interest in the issue of the proposed incinerator at Ford. A waste incinerator already has approval in Horsham and is due to begin construction in summer 2021. When planning was sought, it was implied that the Horsham facility would handle West Sussex waste plus some from surrounding counties. If that was the case, and a reason why the Horsham facility achieved planning consent, WHY is a second facility required in the same county? Surely the Horsham facility should only be handling West Sussex waste if there is a shortfall of capacity in the county? By-products of incineration include carbon dioxide, which is a greenhouse gas, various oxides of nitrogen, fine particulate matter, (defined as particles that are 2.5 microns or less in diameter - referred to as PM2.5), noise, heat and foul odours. At a time when we are discouraging people from burning their own garden waste and central government have legislated against certain solid fuels in home multi-fuel burners because of negative environmental impact, WHY would it be deemed acceptable to allow incineration on a commercial scale? The company will tell us of filters, of monitoring and of guidelines adhered to, but in reality heat, gases and fine particulate matter, due to their nature, cannot be completely filtered out and will therefore be discharged into the atmosphere. Particles of PM2.5 can stay suspended in the air for days or even weeks with the right weather conditions. As they are so light and tiny, when inhaled they reach deep into human and animal lungs and adhere to the moist tissue. Some will diffuse across the membranes into the bloodstream. They cannot be coughed out or expressed, and cause damage to the body. Studies in California, USA have shown that even short-term exposure to PM2.5, (up to 24-hours duration), has been associated with health issues ranging from mild, such as coughs, sneezing and runny eyes, to very serious health concerns such as increased emergency hospital admissions for patients with heart and/or lung conditions, exacerbated acute and chronic bronchitis, asthma attacks and even premature mortality. The most affected groups are babies, young children, the elderly and those with pre-existing heart and lung conditions. Worryingly, children and infants are more susceptible to lung damage from breathing in pollutants as they inhale more air per kilo of body weight than adults because they breathe faster, tend to spend more time active outside and have smaller body size. Children who have grown up breathing such pollutants have been found to have smaller, less efficient lungs at age 18 compared to their peers who have not developed in areas where they have had to inhale particle-laden air. Spokespeople for the company who will directly benefit financially from building and operating the giant incinerator at Ford have stated that, "The facility's emissions will be safe and very carefully monitored to ensure they pose no threat to human health", and that "its pollution targets are set at levels "well below" those which can cause "significant" adverse health effects". However, does the use of the word "significant" mean that moderate or even mild adverse health effects ARE to be considered acceptable to the local population? Secondly, and more importantly, World Health Organisation guidance states that there is NO "healthy" level of pollutants such as PM2.5. None. As a woman in her early-fifties who has profound lung damage secondary to the side effects of chemotherapy treatment, this thought terrifies me on a personal level, but concerns about the physical health of the wider community, especially our young children, are just as frightening. Once, smoking cigarettes was considered a harmless recreational activity and the tobacco companies hid evidence to the contrary; we know better now. Apart from the problematic emissions from the stack, large incinerators and waste-to-energy facilities have also been associated with many other antisocial problems that directly affect local residents' quality of life. These include increased noise levels from facility operation and the movement of large numbers of waste-carrying HGV's in the area, foul odours from emissions and sitting waste, swarms of flies breeding in waste waiting to be incinerated, night time light pollution from warning lights on stacks to prevent low flying aircraft accidents and increased heavy goods traffic on small, local residential roads. Yapton Road and Ford Road really do not have the capacity for frequent, large numbers of heavy vehicles which could make traffic accidents more likely and make it difficult and less safe for residents to take children to school and to get to work. In some areas, the siting of a large incinerator has also had a negative impact on property prices. Would the company running the facility be paying for any upgrades to and maintenance of local infrastructure, compensating homeowners for devalued property or funding medical care for adversely affected residents? I highly doubt it. Designs for the facility and surrounding area have been altered for resubmission, including a shorter stack, building and landscape alterations. The company have stated that they can still operate as efficiently without the bigger facility. How? Will the incinerator processing hours be extended, starting operations earlier in the morning, later at night or into the weekend, for example, therefore disrupting residents? No explanations are given as to how this will be achieved, and no reasons are given for why such a huge facility was originally proposed if a smaller one will suffice,

which I find rather suspect. I would sincerely hope that an educated, caring authority, with a responsibility to its community, would put the health and welfare of the local majority before the financial or other gain of a third-party minority. Thank you. Regards, L Chapman

Received

06/05/2021 13:57:13

Attachments