

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number

Name

Address

Type of Comment

Comments

I object to this planning application for the following reasons: 1. Location in the centre of a growing residential community, for example Yapton 1 km to the west, Climping 1 km to the south, Littlehampton 2km to the east and Arundel 3km to the north east. In terms of scale, this is equivalent to a proposal to site the facility in the middle of Chichester (circa 11 square km). Significant residential housing developments have been or are in the process of being built within a few km of the proposed site, for example in Yapton, Barnham and Ford (Arun District Council's) key strategic site for a new "village" centre including 1,500 houses. 2. Lack of clear balance between advantages and disadvantages of the location, construction and operation of the proposed facility, for example in the voluminous documents comprising the application it was difficult to find a summary of advantages and disadvantages. Rather, a number of sections seem to have been written to deal with potential objections. For example, there is an assertion, without referenced evidence, that there has been no impact on house prices near waste incinerators. If this is correct, then presumably developers of new houses within (say) 10km of the proposed site will be happy to include information about the proposed waste facility in their marketing literature. 3. Visual impact of buildings and twin stacks with main part of ERF being 34.6 metres and twin stacks being 85 metres high. There will be a significant and adverse visual impact. A comment to the effect that there are two "ugly" tall buildings or structures in Littlehampton cannot be a justification for building more tall unsightly buildings. 4. Volume of additional HGV movements on local, mainly rural, roads, including for the 5 year construction period. Even during the COVID lockdown period (outside the tourist season), local roads have been heavy with traffic notably HGVs associated with the numerous housing developments (in progress on applied for) within a 5km radius or so of the proposed site. Options for local residents to avoid this traffic are/will be limited given the two local north-south railway crossings. Doubtless, if the construction of the Arundel bypass starts during the ERF construction period, traffic will become even worse. 5. Adverse air quality impacts (direct and indirect such as diesel pollutants from HGVs) will arise from the construction and operation of the facility. The fact that air pollution in the local area (presumably baselined before the recent heavy new home building programme started) is better than in other parts of the country is no reason to knowingly accept a deterioration in air quality. Initial open source research suggests that the mix of types of waste to be incinerated has a significant impact on the nature and toxicity of effluent gases from a waste incinerator. If so, it would seem prudent to commission an independent assessment of the assumptions, risks and uncertainties associated with the emissions over the operating period of the facility. For example, is it assumed that recycling rates of certain materials will change significantly and will the volume of other materials e.g. single use and non recyclable plastics reduce? 6. Lack of transparency of the monitoring of the actual nature and level of emissions by comparison with permitted levels. Public transparency is not evident in the application; there appears to be a proposal merely to keep records on site. In the very unwelcome event that the application is approved, it is suggested that a condition should be the publication of the monitoring data weekly on a publicly accessible web site. 7. Adverse impact of high and prevailing winds on the dispersal of effluent gases may mean that some areas around the proposed site are significantly more affected than others. What happens for example when wind strengths reach (say) 60 mph? 8. National politics and international developments are casting significant doubt on the wisdom of building more Energy from Waste plants - see attachment. END

Received

Attachments The following files have been uploaded:
[21 Objection No 8 David Tonks.pdf](#)