

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="K Dawson"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="DOUGLAS CLOSE, 23, DOUGLAS CLOSE, ARUNDEL, BN18 0TG"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>As an Arun resident in very close proximity to this redevelopment proposal, I categorically object to the amended proposal (WSCC/011/21) for the following reasons; - Traffic Volume The local road infrastructure was partially improved with the addition of the Bognor/Felpham bypass roads, but no effort or proposed efforts are suggested to reduce congestion upon the back of this proposal/development. The detrimental impact of a suggested 120 vehicles a day that output substantially more emissions and space in comparison to light vehicles has been ignored. The further impact to the road condition will deteriorate further with no suggested maintenance improvement. - Local Economy Impact The suggestion of increased employment is undeniably positive, but the greater influence upon local economy will be negative. This can be highlighted by increased public health diseases and NHS loading through uncontrolled pollution. Through a local loss of tourism due not only to the visual impact of such a devastatingly ugly structure, but also to the traffic, environmental deterioration, traffic increase which is already over capacity and ISO1601 rated environmental businesses looking to relocate to avoid negative association with this plants operations. As the structure will be three times the height of Butlins pavilion, which can be seen from Selsey to Brighton and across the Downs, what will be the impact of this facility on the current local tourism economy? I can assuredly say I would not holiday near such an eyesore or source of pollution. Can they confirm they will attend to the vermin problem from the current storage of waste at Ford? Thousands of seagulls currently nest and feed off the waste with no current interruption or control measures. - Air Quality Reduction (increase in NHS load etc) The identified exhaust emissions are a grave concern. The Motor Industry has taken huge steps to reduce these emissions as public understanding has grown regarding their individual impact upon the environment and human health. NOx, NO, NO2, are likely to be uncontrolled and have direct links to Breathing problems; asthma, emphysema, etc. Particulates are unlikely to be controlled and the impact upon local residents/environments will be devastating. An example would be contamination of both the water table, fresh water areas & salt water zones. There is no recognised current method to reverse the effect of these listed gases and expulsion upon a heavily occupied area is devastating. Many of these emissions from such a commercial output have not been assessed and their individual/combined effect on the local residents, wild life and environment have not been means tested. Can Grundon/Viridor categorically confirm these emissions will not affect any of the above? As mentioned previously the impact of a suggested 120 vehicles making deliveries, possibly dropping latent refuse, can be measured as 240 road journeys a day. Added to this are the operative employees for the vehicles and plant itself. Assuming a workforce of a minimum 100 employees, that's a further 200 local journeys, totalling a minimum of 440 vehicles added to the local emission/congestion/structure. - Impact of approved 3500 Airfield residential development combined with this proposal With the announced proposals for 3500 new homes on the current airfield site, how will the above health, emission and economic concerns be measured? From my understanding this has not been considered. The structure will be towering over the new homes and current village, visible from across the coast and South Downs National Park. I appreciate West Sussex needs a waste management solution, but surely this can be considered at a more logistically central location (I.e near their current Horsham landfills where it has a 360degree logistic radius with more appropriate road infrastructure, hills and natural land to obscure the building. A second factor to consider is the working hours the building will utilise. If a 24hr operation is proposed, the constant noise will be not only disruptive but cause unnecessary stress for the immediate areas residents. I'd be as bold to say no local resident chose to live next to such an operation and should not be forced to endure such a facility. To summarise, surely the following will be directly affected; House prices will be negatively affected, Air quality reduced, Wildlife affected Vermin levels increased Landscaped detrimentally damaged. Uncontained/managed offensive smells emitted to close proximity Local residents health impact (currently unknown) Negative effect on viewpoints, local tourism industry, pleasure flight route including the Goodwood Spitfire experience (something Ford airfield has a heritage in) Opens potential and sets a precedent for further developments further impacting the above points Kind regards, Miss K Dawson</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="15/05/2021 16:40:20"/>
Attachments	