

# Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Application number | <input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>  |
| Name               | <input type="text" value="Kay Wagland"/>  |
| Address            | <input type="text" value="FORD ROAD, 53, FORD ROAD, ARUNDEL, BN18 9EB"/>  |
| Type of Comment    | <input type="text" value="Objection"/>  |
| Comments           | <p>I object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal. The building is overwhelming in size, inappropriate in design and devastating to the landscape. It can be viewed from miles in each direction. The plant processing will generate at least 244 extra daily HGV movements across the the region (or further), some carrying hazardous waste according to the EIA, requiring access from Ford Road which already suffers from excessive HGV use. The construction period will generate over 700 vehicle movements a day. I am not convinced that all movements during this time can be constrained from using the northern end of Ford Road. We should not be increasing freight vehicles on these roads or shipping waste long distances. The ERF process burns oil for combustion of the feedstock waste material and emits CO<sub>2</sub>v and other greenhouse gases. In an international climate crisis, we should not be investing in processes increasing carbon emissions. The incineration process is likely to generate highly toxic carcinogens dioxins and furans. I am concerned to see that these compounds cannot be continuously monitored. The measures supposed to create net gain in biodiversity are pitifully poor. The impact of construction, the site footprint and increase in traffic will not be mitigated by a few bat boxes. If any mitigation was to be achieved, a biodiverse green roof and wall materials providing bird and insect habitat would be needed. The name of the tech park is highly misleading: energy from waste is not part of the circular economy. It is a linear process, actually blocking the circular economy by using materials for feedstock that should be treated according to the waste hierarchy - energy recovery is only one step up from the bottom of the hierarchy, landfill. Worse, as a feedstock to a plant requiring major investment, it will keep requiring more waste to feed it and so deters waste reduction and recycling and maximises residual waste. Developing energy from waste is a failure of resource management and should not be undertaken at scale. There are a number of ERF plants in the south of England - can it be demonstrated by WSCC that they are insufficient to deal with what should be an ever-reducing level of residual waste?</p> |
| Received           | <input type="text" value="11/05/2021 23:18:53"/>  |
| Attachments        |   |