

May i add my voice to Sylvia's argument. It is already projected that longer term this facility will not have sufficient "fuel" from just the local area. So as recycling rates increase and burnable waste "fuel" decreases then in order to operate at the commercial level of the Britanniacrest business case it is likely that "fuel" will need to be brought in from outside of the county. This is contrary to the waste policy of WSCC.

Additionally this shipping in of waste to burn will increase road congestion, increase vehicle emissions and put more HGV vehicles on roads not suitable for the volume. This in turn increases the likelihood of HGVs being involved in accidents with vulnerable road users which are common in this area due to the rural landscape that we love. E.g. cyclists, horse riders, pedestrians.

On no level is this facility warranted or welcomed by the local community. Those of you who rely on our votes to maintain their positions would do well to remember that.

Tim Peters

On 14 Jun 2018, at 11:30, Sylvia Baumgartner wrote:

To Whom It May Concern

I would be grateful if you could ensure the following objections are noted for the Committee, as a resident, I am not sure where, or to whom to provide my objection.

**Firstly** - Why are the numerous rejections of this application being ignored and this application is yet again being presented. It was rejected, the initial concerns have not/and cannot be addressed, yet it has come around again - DOES THIS DIMINISH THIS WHOLE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS, IS IT ABOUT TICKING A BOX TO SAY CONSULTATION WAS UNDERTAKEN, YET JUST GOING AHEAD ANYWAY?

**Secondly** - In terms of the comment below regarding 4.25 - We cannot rely on the Environmental Agency to **control the efficiency of the facility** - they **do not have the power to control, and then lack the resources to investigate and enforce any recommendations they may make**. My evidence for this strong statement is that we asked them to get involved in the drains that keep overflowing on the Wickhurst Green site, as the human waste is overflowing into the stream, and onto the farmland next door - they are unable to compel the developer to do anything, let alone control them. The drains were overflowing just yesterday and has been ongoing for the last 2.5 years.

**Thirdly** - What is West Sussex Council's hidden agenda? Why is it that West Sussex Council seem unable to refuse this application, as has been the case with various other Councils - whilst it may provide jobs, the considerable costs to the tax paying community will be vastly more, over an extremely long period of time. Repairing the roads, controlling the pollution (air, water and ground), downgraded of the area, which leads to considerably more social and legal problems (all of which will cost the council more money).

I look forward to hearing how the Tax Paying Residents of Horsham have been served by the Council, instead of the commercial agenda of the few!

Best wishes

Sylvia Baumgartner