

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="David Underwood"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="THE HAMLETS, 2, THE HAMLETS, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 5RY"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Objection to Planning Application WSCC/011/21 This Application is the replacement for the earlier WSCC/036/20 which was subsequently withdrawn following a huge number of objections. This further application is for exactly the same purpose (burning waste to create energy); the same volume of material 275,000 tonnes of waste plus 20,000 tonnes for recycling; the same amount of lorry traffic; the same environmental impact; two rather than one chimneys of the same 85 metre (276 feet) height; and the reduction in building size is in truth insignificant I would therefore suggest that all of the points made by me, and the significant number of other objectors, to the previous submission hold equally to this one and should therefore be considered as relevant. Points for Objection 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. 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 now proposed. In addition, and significantly, we have the proposed 1600 home residential site planned for the Ford Airfield which is immediately adjacent to the Incinerator site. This is contrary to WHO guidelines. 2. Scale and height of buildings: The size of the 'new' main operational building has been scaled from the plans as: Length - 133 metres, width - 122 metres , height 38.5 meters, plus twin stacks (chimney) each 85 metres tall. There are no other buildings of a comparable size for miles around. 3. Traffic movements and access roads: 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. That makes no sense at all unless you are the company deriving its profitability from such a wide catchment area. Just think of the additional miles travelled every day throughout the county. Traffic volumes: The application estimates the lorry numbers to be about 240 HGV's a day , 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 HGV's each day onto a narrow, unclassified, country road. 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. 5. Potential environmental impact: Clearly there are further questions to be raised on potential environmental impact and the Committee should ask itself, " why would you put a plant like this so close to many residential areas, including a new 1500 home site right next door?" The question has to be asked, what contingency plans are intended for evacuation of residents, HMP Ford prisoners and road diversions in the event of a major contamination issue? I fail to understand how incinerating waste can create more energy than that used to create it. Conclusion: I think it should be clear by now to all who read this that this vast new waste incinerator is totally unsuited to the location the applicants have chosen for it.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="08/05/2021 12:04:23"/>
Attachments	