

To Mr Michael Elkington  
Head of Planning Services  
West Sussex County Council  
County Hall  
CHICHESTER  
PO19 1Rh

Dear Sirs,

### **Objection to Grundon & Viridor Planning Application wsc.011/21**

I would like to strongly object to the above application on the grounds stated below -

My Objection is on the following grounds -

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. It also abuts the Rudford Industrial estate but this is quite small and has no major businesses, certainly nothing anything like the scale of what is proposed.

There is a 1500 home residential site planned for the Ford Airfield which is immediately adjacent to the Incinerator site. This is contrary to World Health Organisation 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 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. It's going to be hideous in comparison.

The size of the 'new' main operational building appears massive.

Length - 133 metres, width - 122 metres, height 38.5 metres, plus twin stacks (chimney) each 85 metres tall.

This is just the main building, not the whole site which is far larger and contains other smaller buildings.

For comparison, the height of the main building is about the same as a 13 storey high block of flats.

The height of the chimney is about 263 feet tall or about the same as a 26 storey block of flats.

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!

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, and this 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.

My understanding is that waste not just from West Sussex, but also from all the surrounding Counties listed in the submission as East Sussex, Hampshire, Surrey and the major towns of Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton.

So some vehicles will travel quite long distances through West Sussex in order to bring their waste to be processed in this relatively quiet corner of this county. We want a greener environmentally friendly England now unnecessary lorries etc travelling on our roads. It will be an awful lot of extra miles travelled every day throughout the county to get the refuse to the site.

In the future alterations may be made to the site which the County Council can't stop and this is VERY worrying.

The application estimates the lorry numbers to be about 240 hgv's 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?

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 queueing 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. Cyclists also use the footpath as the narrow carriageway is not safe for them.

The junction of Church Lane with Horsemere Green Lane 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 statistics, but there are plenty of them.

In my opinion there can be no doubt about the unsuitability of the road as the main access to a new waste facility generating somewhere between 240 and 400 additional, large hgv's per day, or SOME 25 to 40 an hour. This cannot be permitted. This factor alone should be enough to justify a refusal. I note the applicant concludes 'this is not considered to be significant given the low sensitivity of the roads'.

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 things which are damaging to both humans and the environment they live in.

This maybe so, or it may not be, but it is apparent that a pair of 275 foot high chimneys is required to try and get the emissions away from the surrounding area. I suspect that wind and atmospheric changes could have quite an effect on that. 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?

I understand the incineration of waste to provide energy is now regarded as old technology and needs to be phased out as it is second only to coal in the amounts of emissions that it produces. A high percentage of the collected 'recyclable' waste ends up being burnt because it is either contaminated or there is no outlet for it. This can be anything up to 40% of the 'recyclable' material. Thus large quantities of plastics go to incineration and produce some very toxic emissions.

This is one of the dirtiest ways of creating new energy. I consider a plant to recycle plastics would be much more favourably received locally because it is cleaner and does good environmentally.

Why would you put a plant like this so close to many residential areas, including a new 1500 home site right next door?"

This vast new waste incinerator is totally unsuited to the location the Applicant have chosen for it. This is why lots of us are objecting strongly to it. The County Council's decision must be to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,

Signature

Name

Address

Date

29th April, 2021.

[Redacted Signature]

MRS J. E. MARTIN

10 THE BEACHES, WATERFORD 6DNS,  
CLIMPING, W. SUSSEX BN17 5PQ.

[Redacted Name]

MRS J. E. MARTIN