Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Address WEST BARN, ARUNDEL, BN18 9RD Type of Comment I object to this application and ask you to reject it for the following reasons: - it will reduce incentives to recycle - emissions from the facility and vehicles supplying it will contribute to climate change - more vehicles on already overcrowded roads - needs long term commitment of waste supply for commercial viability, so unlikely to recover its costs in the face of advancing technology and any future reduce/re-use/recycle waste policy - visual blot on the landscape visible for miles - toxic gas emissions from burning waste are greater than from burning coal! - incineration produces substantial amounts of toxic ash which has to go to landfill so does not replace the need for landfill - West Sussex should have a reduce, re-use, recycle approach to waste management, aiming for zero waste Detail: The facility will reduce the incentive for recycling West Sussex's waste, contribute to climate change - we have little enough open space left in the coastal areas of West Sussex. I have seen no evidence that this facility is needed and would like West Sussex to follow a reduce, re-use, recycle policy towards waste. Additionally the facility will need to be fed with waste for at least 20 years to justify its cost, yet in this time we would hope to see much improved recycling and packaging technology as well as reduced waste produced due to changes already being implemented by the supermarkets so there is a high risk that it will not recover its costs. Burning waste is environmentally unfriendly and can produce toxic gases, producing more dioxins, mercury, lead, nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxide than burning coal; additionally the resulting ash (which can be up to 20% or more of the volume of the original waste, i.e. substantial) is toxic and needs careful disposal in landfill such that people and wildlife are not at risk of exposure; this will be costly and may be difficult to deliver. Incineration of waste should be avoided and other approaches to dealing with wa	Application number	WSCC/011/21
Type of Comments Objection I object to this application and ask you to reject it for the following reasons: - it will reduce incentives to recycle - emissions from the facility and vehicles supplying it will contribute to climate change - more vehicles on already overcrowded roads - needs long term commitment of waste supply for commercial viability, so unlikely to recover its costs in the face of advancing technology and any future reduce/re-use/recycle waste policy - visual blot on the landscape visible for miles - toxic gas emissions from burning waste are greater than from burning coal! - incineration produces substantial amounts of toxic ash which has to go to landfill so does not replace the need for landfill - West Sussex should have a reduce, re-use, recycle approach to waste management, aiming for zero waste Detail: The facility will reduce the incentive for recycling West Sussex's waste, contribute to climate change with gas emissions and increased vehicles on the roads and be a visual blot on the landscape - we have little enough open space left in the coastal areas of West Sussex. I have seen no evidence that this facility is needed and would like West Sussex to follow a reduce, re-use, recycle policy towards waste. Additionally the facility will need to be fed with waste for at least 20 years to justify its cost, yet in this time we would hope to see much improved recycling and packaging technology as well as reduced waste produced due to changes already being implemented by the supermarkets ot her or at risk of exposure distortion discide than burning coal; additionally the resulting ash (which can be up to 20% or more of the volume of the original waste, i.e. substantial) is toxic and needs careful disposal in landfill such that people and wildlife are not at risk of exposure; this will be costly and may be difficult to deliver. Incineration of waste should be avoided and other approaches to dealing with waste should	Name	Jane Gibbens
CommentCommentsI object to this application and ask you to reject it for the following reasons: - it will reduce incentives to recycle - emissions from the facility and vehicles supplying it will contribute to climate change - more vehicles on already overcrowded roads - needs long term commitment of waste supply for commercial viability, so unlikely to recover its costs in the face of advancing technology and any future 	Address	WEST BARN, ARUNDEL, BN18 9RD
to recycle - emissions from the facility and vehicles supplying it will contribute to climate change - more vehicles on already overcrowded roads - needs long term commitment of waste supply for commercial viability, so unlikely to recover its costs in the face of advancing technology and any future reduce/re-use/recycle waste policy - visual blot on the landscape visible for miles - toxic gas emissions from burning waste are greater than from burning coal! - incineration produces substantial amounts of toxic ash which has to go to landfill so does not replace the need for landfill - West Sussex should have a reduce, re-use, recycle approach to waste management, aiming for zero waste Detail: The facility will reduce the incentive for recycling West Sussex's waste, contribute to climate change with gas emissions and increased vehicles on the roads and be a visual blot on the landscape - we have little enough open space left in the coastal areas of West Sussex. I have seen no evidence that this facility is needed and would like West Sussex to follow a reduce, re-use, recycle policy towards waste. Additionally the facility will need to be fed with waste for at least 20 years to justify its cost, yet in this time we would hope to see much improved recycling and packaging technology as well as reduced waste produced due to changes already being implemented by the supermarkets so there is a high risk that it will not recover its costs. Burning waste is environmentally unfriendly and can produce toxic gases, producing more dioxins, mercury, lead, nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxide than burning coal; additionally the resulting ash (which can be up to 20% or more of the volume of the original waste, i.e. substantial) is toxic and needs careful disposal in landfill such that people and wildlife are not at risk of exposure; this will be costly and may be difficult to deliver. Incineration of waste should be avoided and other approaches to dealing with waste should be pursued. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS APPLICATION.	Type of Comment	Objection
15/05/2021 17.41.50	Comments	to recycle - emissions from the facility and vehicles supplying it will contribute to climate change - more vehicles on already overcrowded roads - needs long term commitment of waste supply for commercial viability, so unlikely to recover its costs in the face of advancing technology and any future reduce/re-use/recycle waste policy - visual blot on the landscape visible for miles - toxic gas emissions from burning waste are greater than from burning coal! - incineration produces substantial amounts of toxic ash which has to go to landfill so does not replace the need for landfill - West Sussex should have a reduce, re-use, recycle approach to waste management, aiming for zero waste Detail: The facility will reduce the incentive for recycling West Sussex's waste, contribute to climate change with gas emissions and increased vehicles on the roads and be a visual blot on the landscape - we have little enough open space left in the coastal areas of West Sussex. I have seen no evidence that this facility is needed and would like West Sussex to follow a reduce, re-use, recycle policy towards waste. Additionally the facility will need to be fed with waste for at least 20 years to justify its cost, yet in this time we would hope to see much improved recycling and packaging technology as well as reduced waste produced due to changes already being implemented by the supermarkets so there is a high risk that it will not recover its costs. Burning waste is environmentally unfriendly and can produce toxic gases, producing more dioxins, mercury, lead, nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxide than burning coal; additionally the resulting ash (which can be up to 20% or more of the volume of the original waste, i.e. substantial) is toxic and needs careful disposal in landfill such that people and wildlife are not at risk of exposure; this will be costly and may be difficult to deliver. Incineration of waste should be avoided and other approaches to dealing with waste should be pursued. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS
	Received	13/05/2021 17:41:56
Attachments	Attachments	