

# Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number

Name

Address

Type of Comment

## Comments

This project involves the building of a structure that will dwarf all others in the immediate area. It will be seen from miles around to truly be a blot on the landscape in the last undeveloped stretch of coast between Pagham in the west to beyond Brighton in the east. Moreover, this is a polluting blot on the landscape. A truly vast amount of refuse is projected to be brought to the facility, stored and processed/burnt. The pollution of the fleet of heavy diesel lorries required (approx. one every 2 minutes) will be immense. Transport of refuse in such lorries leads to the shedding of a vast amount of litter. This is before we consider the pollution, smell and noise of the incinerator complex itself. This is heavy industry being imported into a rural area - it is difficult to think of how a greater impact could be made. And then there are the people of the area. The current residents and businesses, and the proposed residents and businesses. A large number of houses are proposed for this area and they will be built in very close proximity to the incinerator. The mix of heavy industry and residential areas has never been shown to be a good idea for residents or for industry. Then we turn to look at the wider infrastructure required to serve this facility. In short there need to be suitable transport links to allow this vast fleet to flow in and out of the facility. The infrastructure is not there and it does not appear possible to put it in place. Lorries are proposed to flow from the A259 and up Church Lane. The idea that this route can serve such a vast flow of additional traffic is impractical to the point of being fanciful. Similarly fanciful is the idea that this facility contributes to the improvement of the wider environment. A recent 'Dispatches' documentary on Channel 4 concluded that "the total carbon emissions from incineration have now overtaken those from coal". [link: <https://www.channel4.com/press/news/dirty-truth-about-your-rubbish-dispatches-monday-8th-march-8pm-channel-4>] Also, the same programme found that "on average 11% of the waste we put out for recycling is being incinerated". Burning recyclables is short sighted at best. But in providing more incineration capacity I can foresee a reason to burn yet more. An idle incinerator is not profitable; where will the fuel to sustain it come from? We already know that this facility is not needed to accept the waste generated in West Sussex. Thus it is only needed for waste from other counties. So this facility is only needed so that we can offer the surrounding areas the chance to recycle even less. That is irresponsible to our environment. Furthermore, how far is this waste coming? We worry about food miles, but what about the miles of diesel oil that must be burnt to bring the refuse so far? These are unknown and unlimited levels of pollution and carbon emissions that are not worth bearing. As noted above, new housing developments and schools, effectively a new town, are proposed. But these are not consistent with building a new heavy industry site directly abutting it. How can it be that permission for houses has been given and the building of houses abutting new heavy industry is even entertained? This appears to be a recipe for an 'oven-ready' deprived area. Why? Heavy industrial facilities make the surrounding area less desirable to live in - this is well known. But houses must be built and affordable houses need to be built. I would predict that this proportion of affordable housing would rise significantly if the housing developers profits are blighted by the presence or threat of a heavy industry incinerator. Still further, constrained profit means affordable housing that is even more 'cheaply built' Thus a perfect storm brews For a developer now presented with the economics of building houses in the shadow of heavy industry there will be pressure to build cheaper homes as there will be less demand for less affordable, larger homes in an industrial area. Thus the proportion of cheaper homes rises and simple economics dictates that a mixed residential area will not be profitable. Consequently, no developer will build such a desirable mixed residential area in the shadow of heavy industry. The result is that you have built not a shiny new town but a prefabricated deprived area. A mass of insufficiently mixed cheap and/or affordable housing abutting heavy industry is a 'model' that has been seen in the UK for about 170 years now. This model does not lead to economic prosperity and wellbeing for the residents but depression and deprivation. This appears to be on the horizon here. Indeed such an analysis chimes with a recent article in the national press that notes that incinerators are preferentially sited in deprived areas. [Link: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/jul/31/uk-waste-incinerators-three-times-more-likely-to-be-in-deprived-areas>]. However, our area is not yet deprived. We must steer away from these shoals; it would be stupid to drive ourselves onto the rocks. In Conclusion: Heavy industry is proposed for a rural area in the shape of this vast complex. The pollution of the site in terms of pollution, smell and noise is magnified by the pollution of the fleet of diesel transporters required to service it. The transport infrastructure is inadequate and cannot be made adequate. The proposed facility will be the biggest building in the area by far; its volume will dwarf any other building for miles and miles around. Its proposed chimneys are huge. The plume from them will be even bigger and more visible. The proposed facility and its heavy industrial nature is simply incompatible with residential areas and

especially the new houses being built close to the proposed site. The facility will thus blight the lives and homes of residents. This planning application must be rejected.

Received

16/05/2021 23:28:22

Attachments The following files have been uploaded:

[Comment on Application WSCC\\_011\\_21\\_Viridor\\_grundon\\_incinerator.pdf](#)