

# Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Janice Roberts"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="CROPTHORNE DRIVE, 11, CROPTHORNE DRIVE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 5GG"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

Once again I feel compelled to raise my objections to the proposed Energy Recovery Facility and Waste Sorting and Transfer Facility at Ford.

In the broader context this proposal is in conflict with numerous policies:

The WLP states that proposals for waste development will be permitted provided they do not have an unacceptable impact on the character, distinctiveness and sense of a place and indeed where possible reinforce the character of the locale including the retention of important features or characteristics: This proposal has no regard for the character of the site.

Neither does take account of the topography, landscape, streetscape or skyline of the surrounding area.

It does not respect the views in or out of the site.

Furthermore, this proposal does not take into account the use of materials or building styles in the locality.

It is indisputably a large scale industrial development set in a semi rural environment, the scale of which is completely at odds with other developments in the area. The design of the building, essentially an angular box with 85m chimney stacks will sit on the landscape and in no way blend in with the landscape. It will dominate the skyline and will stand out from the surrounding topography of this flat coastal plain. Landscaping and tree planting will not be able to screen such a large development and it will undoubtedly spoil the views across the coastal plain, towards and from the South Downs National Park. Indeed, the visual impact of the proposed facility is contrary to the Clymping Neighbourhood Plan that seeks to protect open views. We should remember and respect this rural landscape which provides the context for the cultural heritage of the surrounding villages and of the WW2 airfield.

Plans for waste management at local and national level aim to minimise carbon emissions. The NFPP states the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future and . shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Similarly the WLP states developments should minimise carbon emissions, to adapt to and mitigate the potential adverse impacts of climate change. The incineration of waste does not produce green clean energy. It is second to last on the waste management hierarchy, additionally it produces twice as much carbon dioxide as more conventional means of energy production largely due to the poor quality of waste sorting. Additional CO2 emissions will be derived from operational traffic and there is not even a nod towards a move to any form of electric vehicles or charging points for staff within these proposals.

This proposal is so clearly at odds with these and other planning policies I find it hard to understand why it is still under consideration, especially as it deviates from the WLP in that it now exceeds the previously designated 45,000 tpa.

A location in the south of the county seems counterintuitive for a facility that will be handling countywide waste. Surely a more centrally located facility would be logical? The geographical position of this site for handling waste from West Sussex's coastal strip is described as easily accessible. Whilst on a map this may appear to be the case anyone who regularly uses local roads will be well aware of the increasing congestion and delays. Waste from neighbouring coastal towns will access the site via the A27 which to the east sees queuing traffic through most of the day and stop-start traffic at rush hour especially through Worthing. To the north and west the unresolved nature of the A27 bypass at Arundel and Chichester further undermines to accessibility of this site. Additionally the B259 sees increasing congestion. Improvements such as the Lyminster bypass do not provide a complete solution and the Bognor Regis bypass is incomplete, again seeing stop-start traffic at peak times. Waste from further afield will still use these routes. Surely such sites need to be serviced by major roads, motorways or rail to ensure efficient movements of waste.

At a more local scale the proposal will have a considerable negative impact on local communities who will see little gain. Indeed the amendments see a reduction in available jobs for the local community. The aforementioned traffic issues are compounded on the immediate access route via Church Lane and Ford Road both of which are unclassified. At peak flows traffic routinely queues at the Church Lane roundabout in all directions. This will be further increased by the addition of 1500 and 300 new

houses at Yapton and Climping respectively. These roads are too small to carry the number and size of vehicles that will be accessing this site. As a regular user of the footpath along Church Lane I find it very unpleasant - the footpath is narrow and often overgrown, the volume of traffic especially the number of large vehicles and HGVs, and the speed at which they pass is intimidating as you are physically 'blown' (to the point of having to turn away from the traffic as they pass). Furthermore the road is often hard to cross. There is no provision for the numerous cyclists who use this route, recreationally or to access the train and work, some, understandably, use the pavement. Increased numbers of bigger, heavier HGVs especially, will reduce public amenity - of those who want to access work, the beach, local school, village hall and playing fields.

Unarguably there will be negative impacts on the local communities. This development is not in keeping with the immediate locale and I find it incredulous that WSCC is seriously considering this proposal when the adjacent land is designated for housing! The incompatibility is obvious - surely? There will be increased air pollution and associated health impacts, the extent of which are not fully researched and are based on the presumption that such incinerators make only a small contribution to air pollution in an area which of course would not be the case here. This facility will present a nuisance to its neighbours - unsightly chimneys, plumes and spoilt views, night light (infringing the NP's Dark Skies policy), noise, odour, pests/vermin, litter.

Our government claims it is 'green'. With COP 26 we should, at every level, be taking action against climate change, embracing new, green technologies and looking to a positive future. This facility undermines recycling and uses out-dated, dirty and environmentally damaging technology. I see many negatives for those of us who will have to live with it and no real gain. What is WSCC going to gain that makes this proposal worth so much consideration?

Received

04/09/2021 00:20:42

Attachments