

GPP

GP PLANNING LTD



**APPENDICES
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**Appeal by Britaniacrest Recycling Ltd
Land at former Wealden Brickworks
PINS Ref – APP/P3800/W/18/3218965
LPA Ref – WSCC/015/18/NH**

Land at Wealden Brickworks	NI4H	H008-01
-----------------------------------	-------------	----------------

Revision	Comments	Author	Date
1	FINAL	MD	1 st October 2019

APPENDIX A: Evaluation of the Climate Change Impacts of the Energy from Waste Plant Proposed for Wealden Brickworks, Horsham – Only Solutions September 2019

- **A1:Excerpts from Valuation of Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas Background documentation (April 2019)**
- **A2:Energy recovery for residual waste - A carbon based modelling approach (February 2014)**
- **A3:Excerpts from Annex III - Technology-specific Cost and Performance Parameters**
- **A4:Excerpts from Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011**
- **A5:Excerpts from Appeal Ref 2224529 – Former Ravenhead Glass Warehouse, Lock Street, St Helens (August 2015)**
- **A6:Excerpts from Environmental Permit Application SP3038DY (February 2017)**
- **A7:Excerpts from Valuation of Energy Use and Greenhouse Gas (April 2019)**
- **A8:Excerpts from Energy from waste A guide to the debate (February 2014)**
- **A9:Excerpts from 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories**
- **A10:Excerpts from A Changing Climate for Energy from Waste (2006)**
- **A11:Excerpts from Assessment of the options to improve the management of bio-waste in the European Union (2010)**
- **A12:Excerpts from Biogenic Carbon and Temporary Storage Addressed with Dynamic Life Cycle Assessment (2012)**

APPENDIX B: Extracts from West Sussex Waste Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report, March 2013

APPENDIX C: AL 14, SASEA Assessment Table

APPENDIX D: Analysis of Representations

APPENDIX E: Extract from the Encyclopaedia of Planning Law, Public Concerns about Safety

**APPENDIX B: Extracts from West Sussex Waste Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report,
March 2013**

Appendix B

Extract from West Sussex Waste Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report, March 2013

1.1.1 The SA objectives, targets and indicators are set out at Appendix E of the SA. In respect of my evidence the following indicators and SA outcomes are relevant:

- B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks
- G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character.
- P: To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.

1.1.2 The interpretation., decision making criteria and assumptions, draft indicator (s) and target (if applicable are set out below and then applied to each policy and each site therein.

B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks.	Would the option/policy/site be likely to impact on PROW or other users of the countryside including road and rail users, for example, by blocking PROW, increased traffic in the area, or by affecting public views? Would the option/policy/site reduce the tranquillity of the area, specific consideration to protected landscapes?	Number of PROW diversions Number of PROW stopped up Number of new PROW opened Proportion of land classed as tranquil.	All Public Rights of Way must remain open and available for public use at all times unless the Local Authority has undertaken the relevant legal procedure. Planning permission alone does not allow the right of way to be obstructed or moved in any way.
--	--	--	---

G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character.	Would the option/policy/site help enable protection of landscape (particularly AONB and SDNP) and townscape character?	Number/extent (area) of planning consents issued on greenfield land outside defined urban areas by type. Percentage of land classified as tranquil. Number of planning consents in AONB and SDNP by type.	None identified
---	--	---	-----------------

P: To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	Would the option/policy/site affect carbon dioxide and methane emissions production in the county? E.g. reduce the quantity of biologically active waste landfilled? Would the options/policy/site encourage and increase production/use of renewable or lower carbon energy supplies?	<p>Greenhouse Gas emissions (Mt)</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions from landfill (tonnes).</p> <p>Number of new waste facilities in West Sussex generating energy from waste.</p> <p>Energy from renewable and low-carbon sources.</p>	<p><u>International:</u></p> <p>Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012</p> <p><u>National:</u></p> <p>Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of green house gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.</p> <p>15% of energy from renewable sources by 2020.</p> <p><u>Regional:</u></p> <p>To achieve 895MW by 2016 and 1130MW by 2020.</p>
--	--	--	---

1.1.3 SA objectives, the relevant mitigation/enhancement and commentary for the policy (found at page 317 of the SA) are extracted below.

Policy W10: Strategic Waste Site Allocations					
<p>(a) The following sites are allocated for waste management facilities and are acceptable, in principle, for the development of proposals for the transfer, recycling, and/or treatment of waste (including the recycling of inert waste):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site north of Wastewater Treatment Works, Ford (Inset Map 1); • Hobbs Barn, near Climping (Inset Map 2); • Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester (Inset Map 3); • Brookhurst Wood, near Horsham (Inset Map 4); and • Land west of Wastewater Treatment Works, Goddards Green (Inset Map 5). <p>(b) The following site is allocated for non-inert landfill and is acceptable, in principle, for that purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension to Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site, near Horsham (Inset Map 4). <p>(c) The development of a site allocated under (a)-(b) must take place in accordance with the policies of this Plan and satisfactorily address the 'development principles' for that site identified in the supporting text to this policy.</p> <p>(d) The sites allocated under (a)-(b) will be safeguarded from any development either on or adjoining the sites that would prevent or prejudice their development (in whole or in part) for the allocated waste management use or uses.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W10			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	Policy should be applied alongside development management policies.	Sites have been selected as optimal sites and are dispersed justifies neutral impact. Site preferable to others.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	N	N	N	As above	As above
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character.	<p>Sites have been assessed in terms of their landscape impact and their dispersal means than cumulative impacts are minimised. Negative score given in the short term with neutral in the medium and long term as mitigation measures are established.</p> <p>Potential cumulative impact on views from the SDNP from Site North of WWTW (Ford) and Fuel Depot (Chichester) if tall stacks proposed.</p>
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W12: High Quality Development.	Cumulative effect of sites would mean that more waste would be diverted from landfill therefore reducing methane emissions. Sites could also offer opportunity for renewable or lower carbon energy.

1.1.4 The Brookhurst Wood site was appraised in two parts (the built waste facility where the Appeal proposals would be located) and an extension to the landfill (land to the north). The assessment begins at page 359 of the SA:

Horsham District - Brookhurst Wood, near Warnham (Built Waste Facility)					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	N	Assume that development management principles and policies in Plan are applied. Protection/mitigation of PROW.	Construction impacts may give rise to negative effects due to noise and views. Improved landscaping would reduce impact on public views in the medium term. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	N	Site currently has adequate screening, however new facilities may require additional landscaping/screening.	There are no landscape designations. Development of the site represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of/or replace the existing derelict buildings. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the development management/waste regulation processes.	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. The close proximity of the site to potential users of energy produced (if EfW technology built) does offer potential benefits.
Assessment Summary	<p>The site is well-located to manage waste due to its proximity to waste arisings in the north of the county, close to the Lorry Route Network and it has potential to move waste by rail (subject to viability assessment).</p> <p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as it would benefit from co-location of other waste facilities and replace existing derelict buildings.</p> <p>Transport assessment at application stage should assess impacts on residents of Langhurstwood Road, particularly due to potential cumulative impacts from other waste uses. Routing should also be via the south and impacts on the A264 and junction 11 of M23 need to be considered.</p> <p>There are industrial buildings on the site therefore an industrial archaeological impact assessment required at application stage.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to SSSI, Ancient Woodland and there may be protected species (Great Crested Newts) which would require survey and mitigation. Site should not exceed critical load of site limits in terms of air quality and consideration given to lorry routing to avoid impacts. Habitat Regulation Assessment concludes that there is no scope for pathways connecting European sites.</p> <p>The potential for risk of birdstrike in lieu of the Gatwick airport bird circle requires a comprehensive bird management plan.</p>				

APPENDIX C: AL 14, SASEA Assessment Table

Appendix C

AL 14, SASEA Assessment Table

AL14 – Warnham and Wealden Brickworks, Horsham

SA/ SEA Objective	Summary of effects	Short term	Medium term	Long term
1 Access to Affordable Homes	Site not identified for housing provision	☹	☹	☹
2 Access to services and facilities	Site would provide waste disposal facility	☹	☹	☹
3 Reduce crime and fear of crime	Effects uncertain	?	?	?
4 Conserve & Enhance land and townscape character	Proposal would be redevelopment of an existing site, but new uses could have a further impact on the land and townscape	☹?	☹?	☹?
5 Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Site involves redevelopment of existing site and effects on biodiversity likely to be small	☹?	☹?	☹?
6 Conserve and enhance historical environment	Site is close to ancient monument. Unlikely it would be affected, but further work may be beneficial	☹?	☹?	☹?
7 Maintain high quality environment in terms of air soil and water quality	Although development could help clean up existing contamination on site, but harm air quality / water quality through burning of landfill gas and waste uses	☹?	☹?	☹?
8 Reduce car journeys and promote alternative means of transport	Site is in a relatively remote condition and would probably result in increased car journeys for those employed at the site	☹	☹	☹
9 To reduce the risk of flooding	Site is already brownfield and runoff unlikely to increase significantly as a result of new development	☹	☹	☹
10 Efficient land use by prioritising brownfield land	Site would result in re-use of brownfield land	☹	☹	☹
11 Reduce waste and maximise recycling	Site would include facilities for recycling and recovery of waste	☹	☹	☹
12 Ensure energy and water consumption is as efficient as possible	Site would require use of energy and water use, but effects depend on amount required and whether energy is supplied from power plant on site	?	?	?
13 Reduce greenhouse gases by encouraging provision and use of renewable energy	Development would retain power plant which burns methane. This is a worse greenhouse gas than CO2 which would be produced as a result	☹	☹	☹
14 Maintain overall high and stable economy	Redevelopment of the site is likely to be beneficial to the economy by providing employment land, and jobs during construction phase	☹	☹	☹
15 Enhance areas of inequalities in economy including rural areas	Site is in a rural location and could help economy in this area. Most employees will probably live in Horsham	☹?	☹?	☹?
16 Maintain and enhance vitality and viability of Horsham town and other village centres	Site is outside town or village centres	☹	☹	☹

Assessment of significance: This site would have some impact if increased traffic to the site, but relatively limited at the site is already in use and would use the same footprint

☺☺	The option provides a strong positive effect towards the SA/SEA objective
☺	The option provides a positive effect towards the SA/SEA objective
☹	This option has no effect on the SA/SEA objective
☹☹	The option provides a negative effect towards the SA/SEA objective
☹☹☹	The option provides a strong negative effect towards the SA/SEA objective
?	The effects on this objective are uncertain

Note: the key is found at page 84 of the SASEA

APPENDIX D: Analysis of Representations

Appendix E

Extract from the Encyclopaedia of Planning Law

Public concerns about safety:

P70.39

Public concern, as opposed to actual evidence of threats to public safety, can be a material consideration with respect to planning decisions. In **Newport BC v Secretary of State for Wales** [1998] Env. L.R. 174 the Court of Appeal allowed the local planning authority's appeal against a decision on the part of the Secretary of State awarding costs against it following an appeal on the basis that the authority had acted unreasonably in taking into account the public perception of danger emanating from a chemical waste treatment plant which was unsupported by evidence. The court held that it was a material error of law to conclude that a genuinely held public perception of danger which was unfounded could never amount to a valid ground for refusal.

That decision was applied in *Trevett v Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions* [2002] EWHC 2696 (Admin), a challenge to a decision made on appeal under s.78 of the 1990 Act to grant planning permission for three telecommunications masts at three sites near Stroud in Gloucestershire. The claimant lived close to one of the masts and was concerned about the potential health effects of the development on children attending the local primary school and her own children when they visited her from America. The court (Sullivan J, as he then was) dismissed the appeal on the basis that the inspector had been entitled to place the weight that he did on the professional views of national and international organisations to the effect that TETRA stations (as were in issue in this case) did not pose a greater risk to health than mobile phone stations. In reaching this conclusion, however, he had properly followed the **Newport** approach and had recognised that the perceived adverse effects on health of the public could justify a refusal of planning permission.

It should be noted that as at the time of this decision Planning Policy Guidance note 8: Telecommunications remained extant. Paragraph 97 of that document confirmed that health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission. The guidance in PPG8 has now been replaced by that to be found in s.5 of the National Planning Policy Framework, where there is no reference to health considerations or public concern as comprising material planning considerations. Paragraph 97 of PPG8 simply reflected the existing law, however, which remains unchanged. The issue of the relevance of public concern to planning also arose in *West Midlands Probation Committee v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions* (1998) 76 P. & C. R. 589. This case concerned an appeal by the West Midlands Probation Committee against the dismissal of its appeal against a refusal of planning permission for an extension to a bail and probation hostel, the inspector having found that the extension would be likely to increase significantly the disturbance caused to nearby residents. The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal.

The following propositions may be suggested on the basis of the case law:

(a)

public safety is clearly capable of being a material consideration in determining planning applications;

(b)

so too are any potential physical externalities: this is the basis of the *West Midlands Probation Committee* case. The concerns held by residents were justified concerns because of a history of disturbing behaviour, and the Court of Appeal was unwilling to distinguish the impact of this conduct upon the use of adjoining land from the impact of, e.g. polluting discharges by way of smoke or fumes, or unneighbourly uses: "There can be no assumption that the use of the land as a bail and probation hostel will not interfere with the reasonable use of adjoining land when the evidence is that it does";

(c)

public opposition per se is not a material consideration (per Aldous LJ in **Newport**), even though it may be a powerful background consideration in a democratically based planning system;

(d)

the fact that fears and concerns are held by members of the public may itself constitute a material consideration, if:

(i)

they relate to a matter (e.g. public safety, interference with reasonable use of adjoining land) which is itself a material consideration; or

(ii)

they are objectively justified (as in *West Midlands Probation Committee*). If the proposed development would introduce or increase a risk of danger, that must be a factor to be assessed and weighed in the balance; or

(iii)

if the fact that they exist, even if baseless, may itself have land-use consequences. For example, in the *Broadland* case, it was conceded that the officers had been wrong to advise the Council that increased car trips resulting from parents' concerns about the safety of their children was not a material consideration;

(e)

whether such fears and concerns must be dismissed if they are shown to be baseless is less clear, not least because this may not always be as sharp a distinction as that terminology suggests. Differences over safety, for example, usually boil down to the acceptability of different degrees of risk, rather than a clear conclusion that the fear is either justified or baseless. The primary task of the decision maker in such a case must be to determine the acceptability of the risk. That seems to be the approach adopted by Glidewell LJ in *Gateshead MBC v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1994] 1 P.L.R. 85 at 95, who said:

"Public concern is, of course, and must be recognised by the Secretary of State to be, a material consideration for him to take into account. But if in the end that public concern is not justified, it cannot be conclusive. If it were, no industrial development—indeed very little development of any kind—would ever be permitted.;"

(f)

however, the majority in **Newport** seem to go further than this, and to accept that even fears that have been shown to be unjustified may continue to be a material consideration: "local fears which are not, in fact, justified can rank as part of the human factor [per Lord Scarman in *Westminster City Council v Great Portland Estates plc*] and can be given direct effect as an exceptional or special circumstance."

Two points may be worth recording on that proposition:

(i)

that there is a very thin line between unjustified local fears and pure prejudice, including discrimination on racial or other unlawful grounds; and

(ii)

it must follow, if unjustified local fear is capable of being a material consideration, that it could on its own justify a departure from the development plan and justify a refusal of permission. This approach is clearly contrary to the approach taken by Glidewell L.J. in the Court of Appeal in *Gateshead* (above).

(g)

Although presented in **Newport** as a distinction of principle, there is good reason in practice to regard it as one of degree, because:

(i)

the issue at stake in **Newport** was not whether unjustified public fears were to be permitted to influence the planning decision, but whether the authority had acted unreasonably, in the context of an application for an award of costs against them, in citing, as a reason for refusing planning permission, that: "(4) The proposed development is perceived by the local community to be contrary to the public interest generally and to their interests in particular";

(ii)

hence the matter was being considered at a stage that was one remove from the other cases cited above;

(iii)

a matter may constitute a material consideration without being conclusive of the issue. It is a matter wholly for the decision-maker what weight to accord to any material consideration, and in practice there may be little difference between the weight attached to a consideration which is material but peripheral, and one which is not material at all;

(iv)

even if a matter is found to have been material, but has been ignored by the decision-maker, the broad discretion of the court on a statutory appeal (against a decision of the Secretary of State) or a judicial review application (against a decision of a local planning authority) means that the decision is not necessarily invalid, and it is for the court to consider whether, had it been taken into account, there is a real possibility that it would have made a difference to the decision (*Broadland*, on judicial review, applying the principles summarised for statutory appeals by Glidewell L.J. in *Bolton MBC v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1990) 61 P. & C.R. 343 at 353);

(v)

the consistent approach of the courts to material considerations has been to avoid establishing a priori distinctions between matters which are, and those which are not, material considerations. Ever since *Stringer v Ministry of Housing and Local Government* [1971] 1 All E.R. 64 the approach has been inclusive rather than exclusive, so as to allow the real distinctions to be drawn by decision makers in weighing the evidence, rather than by courts in drawing fine distinctions affecting the validity of decisions.

Health concerns have become a significant issue surrounding the erection of telecommunications masts, and their intensification of use by the addition of further equipment. Specific guidance is given in PPG8, where paras.97 and 98 of the appendix provide:

"97.

Health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval. Whether such matters are material in a particular case is ultimately a matter for the courts. It is for the decision-maker (usually the local planning authority) to determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case.

98.

However, it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains Central Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government's view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them."

These paragraphs formed the subject of the decision of the Court of Appeal in *T Mobile UK Ltd v First Secretary of State* [2004] EWCA Civ 1763 (Pill, Mummery and Laws L.JJ.; 12th November 2004) in which an appeal proposal, which complied with ICNIRP guidelines, was dismissed by an Inspector purportedly in accordance with the above policy (in particular, para.97). The court held that this was an erroneous approach. It would be open to the decision-maker to identify some exceptional circumstance whereby, despite compliance with your ICNIRP guidelines, health concerns should constitute a material consideration justifying

refusal. But such a course would amount to a departure from policy, to be recognised as such: see also *Alan Cox v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, North Hertfordshire DC and T-Mobile (UK) Ltd* [2010] EWHC 104 (Admin); see also *Alan Cox v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, North Hertfordshire DC and T-Mobile (UK) Ltd* [2010] EWHC 104 (Admin).

APPENDIX E: Extract from the Encyclopaedia of Planning Law, Public Concerns about Safety



No Incinerator 4 Horsham Community Group

Website: ni4h.org

Email: NoIncinerator4Horsham@gmail.com

PUBLIC PERCEPTION ANALYSIS

PREPARED BY

NO INCINERATOR 4 HORSHAM COMMUNITY GROUP

TO INFORM A PUBLIC INQUIRY

PINS Reference: APP/P3800/W/18/3218965

WSCC Reference: WSCC/015/18/NH

September 2019

Contents

1. Introduction to NI4H
2. Six Reasons for Refusal Survey
3. Public Perception Analysis
4. Third-Party Representations Sent to Council at Planning Stage
5. Third-Party Representations Sent to Planning Inspector at Appeal Stage
6. Examples of Public Perception of Harm Comments
7. Conclusion
8. Statistical Analysis of Object Comments at Horsham Incinerator Planning and Appeal Stages

1. Introduction to NI4H

- 1.1 No Incinerator for Horsham Community Group (NI4H) is a voluntary group formed in 2016 by local residents to raise awareness and campaign against the proposal for a large-scale incinerator in Horsham to import waste from a wide area across the Southern Counties.
- 1.2 NI4H had Rule 6 status imposed on the Group at the Pre-Inquiry Meeting on 6th June 2019.
- 1.3 NI4H has engaged with members of the public through organising two petitions, holding public meetings and exhibitions, through fundraising events, the media and social media. Whilst acknowledging these are not formal tools in the planning process, NI4H asks the Planning Inspector to note the 4,532 members of the public at planning application stage, and 2,031 members of the public (so far) at planning appeal stage, who have signed NI4H petitions and feel very strongly that this planning appeal should be dismissed.
- 1.4 Representatives of NI4H spent several days at the Swindon Public Inquiry in January and February 2019 and saw how their Community Group was labelled 'Project Fear' by the Appellant's barrister, though there appeared to be no evidence of this. So NI4H has taken great care over website content, press releases, social media publicity, newsletters, printed material and discussions with the public.
- 1.5 NI4H has spent many hours reviewing evidence in the public domain, including the comments made by members of the public at planning and appeal stages.

2. Six Reasons for Refusal Survey

- 2.1 When West Sussex County Council reviewed the six reasons for refusal, NI4H drafted a Reasons for Refusal Survey to find out which reasons are important to the public.
- 2.2 The survey listed the Council's six reasons for refusal of the planning application and asked: Which ones are most important to you? Please tick or give each of them a score:
1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = not very important

2.3 14 completed surveys were returned. The results are presented in the following chart.

Reasons for Refusal Survey Results

Reason for Refusal	Very Important	Important	Not very important
It has not been demonstrated that the facility is needed to maintain net self-sufficiency to manage the transfer, recycling and treatment of waste generated within West Sussex	5	5	3
The development would have an unacceptable impact on landscape and visual amenity of the area	7	5	1
The development would have an unacceptable impact on highway capacity	6	4	2
The development would have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity	7	2	2
The development would have an unacceptable impact on public health	12	0	2
The development, along with other existing, allocated and permitted development, including the North of Horsham development, would result in adverse cumulative impacts	10	2	1

2.5 The most important reason listed was ‘The development would have an unacceptable impact on public health’ closely followed by ‘The development, along with other existing, allocated and permitted development, including the North of Horsham development, would result in adverse cumulative impacts’.

3. Public Perception Analysis

- 3.1 With limited resources NI4H was not able to extend the survey to a larger number of people, and so analysed in more detail the ‘object’ comments sent to the Council at Planning Stage and to the Planning Inspector at Appeal Stage.
- 3.2 NI4H compiled a spreadsheet using the Council’s six reasons for refusal plus a seventh reason ‘The development would have unacceptable environmental impacts’ subdivided into: Reduce/Recycle, Air Pollution, Noise Pollution and Light Pollution.

- 3.3 The public comments were carefully read and recorded on the spreadsheets with a number 1 added to the relevant columns for each appropriate mention in the comments. This tally record was made by one person to give consistency in determining the reasons expressed in each submission or representation.
- 3.4 Comments like “I don’t want my children near this” could infer unacceptable impact on Public Health, but unless health related concerns were mentioned in the comments, they were not scored as such.
- 3.5 NI4H conducted a statistical analysis using AutoSum to calculate the total number of each response and calculated the percentages.

4. Third-Party Representations Sent to Council at Planning Stage

- 4.1 NI4H has noted 1,284 representations received by the Council are on the Planning Portal. 148 individually listed in Public Comments (all these were analysed) and 1,136 listed in ‘Representation emails and on-line received 15 March – 10 May 2018’ the first 150 of which were analysed. A total of 298 submissions, 23.2% were analysed.
- 4.2 1,272 (93%) objected to the appeal, 12 (7%) supported the appeal.

5. Third-Party Representations Sent to Planning Inspector at Appeal Stage

- 5.1 262 submissions are recorded on the Third-Party Representations sent to PINS List – Part 1, Part 2a and Part2b of which: 250 (95%) objected to the appeal, 12 (5%) supported the appeal.
- 5.2 One or more of these environmental impacts were mentioned in 212 submissions, 85%: reduce/recycle, air pollution, noise pollution and light pollution.

6. Examples of Public Perception of Harm Comments

- 6.1 Here is a selection from the 1,546 comments objection comments which represent the concerns expressed by many local residents.
- 6.2 Looking down from areas like Tower Hill; a person can see the black steeple of St. Mary's church on the South of town, and the pale steeple of what used to be St. Mark's church in the North. It's currently a beautiful picture which speaks of tranquillity and our local history. Please don't let it be ruined.
- 6.3 I feel it is unsafe now to walk or cycle from my house as a result of the 700+ HGV vehicle movements at a speed which is not suitable in my view on what is a rural country road. I leave and come home when it is dark and am often put at risk walking down Mercer Road and Langhurst Wood Road. Walkers and cyclists are being dismissed as road users.
- 6.4 The 95m stack and the enormous plume will be visible from our garden and road. This will be a constant reminder of the risks of living so near it and will devalue our property, which currently has rural, residential views.
- 6.5 What evidence do you have that this facility will not be a Public Health concern?
- 6.6 Born and bred in Horsham we do not wish ourselves, our children and grand-children to be endangered by breathing in invisible toxins from this proposed facility.
- 6.7 It doesn't matter what precautions are taken, we do not have a good enough understanding of the emissions to be able to guarantee peoples safety. At one point smoking was good for you and diesel cars were better than petrol !
- 6.8 My child suffers with Asthma and to hear we are going to enhance Horsham with pollution and potentially toxic frightens me. There will be more cases of our younger generation with breathing difficulties, a study did show that living near a busy road increased children with having asthma, goodness knows what an incinerator will do!

- 6.10 The community should work together in reducing waste, recycling and reusing!
- 6.11 As residents in the town, we are not even allowed to have a bonfire these days, then why is a massive chimney chucking out smoke from dusk to dawn, even being considered as safe!
- 6.12 There is insufficient study into the distribution of pollutants once leaving the stack. Effects of aircraft vortex have not been modelled nor has the fact that the Warnham area sits within a geographic 'bowl' which effectively traps air. This is frequently experienced with the odours emanating from the Landfill and MBT sites especially where weather conditions conspire to trap smells affecting local residents.
- 6.13 One assumes that the thin 95m chimney will have to be cable stayed in some manner – where will the tie down point be and can they fit it on the site? There is no mention of high pitched whine when wind blows around these cables.
- 6.14 Permanently lit with red aviation lights a permanent hazard for aircraft and helicopters.
- 6.16 Light pollution will affect local residents and wildlife, including breeding Red Kites and Bat colonies.
- 6.17 Turbulence created by aircraft may drive the fine particulate emissions from the chimney down to the ground. Increased air traffic movements will exacerbate this issue.
- 6.18 Local farmland, where both crops and livestock are grown for human consumption, Warnham Nature reserve is within very close proximity.
- 6.19 With increased pollution comes irreversible impact on bird life, insect life and all flora and fauna in the vicinity. Our neighbours and our home is also host to endangered swifts, honey bees and barn owls to name a few. We have a very special ecosystem in this area growing elderflower, blackberries and apples, rearing ducks and chickens and of course the local deer. We need to preserve all this for the future.
- 6.20 Too close to housing, existing and new schools.

- 6.21 I also worry about the prospect of a fire at such a plant and its proximity to the MBT, landfill and the areas of woodland. Movement in and out of flammable chemicals or hazardous/ contaminated material from site, adds to the risks/ health hazards if a fire were to occur.
- 6.22 There is insufficient evidence to allay resident's concerns about need, highway capacity, public health and the cumulative impact that development may have on the future residents.

7. Conclusion

Peter Catchpole who has been West Sussex County Councillor for Holbrook since 2005 and is Chairman of Ni4H said:

“The response from the residents of Horsham in overwhelmingly objecting to the development of this incinerator in North Horsham is by far the largest reaction to any planning application I have seen in my 14 years as County Councillor for Holbrook. They are rightly concerned about their future wellbeing and that of future generations if an incinerator comes to this area. This overwhelming NO vote is democracy at work and should be given the authority it deserves and fully respected.”

8. Statistical Analysis of Object Comments at Horsham Incinerator Planning and Appeal Stages

1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Need	Landscape and Visual Impact	Highway Capacity	Residential Amenity	Public Health	Cumulative Impact	Environmental Impact			
						Reduce Recycle	Air Pollution	Noise Pollution	Light Pollution
PLANNING STAGE									
130	190	197	144	139	79	138	235	115	125
44%	64%	66%	48%	47%	27%	46%	79%	39%	42%
APPEAL STAGE									
93	150	153	134	172	139	103	173	47	43
37%	60%	61%	54%	69%	56%	41%	69%	19%	17%

GP P

GP PLANNING LTD

GP PLANNING LTD

Mr Christian Smith DipTP MRTPI MCMI
Miss Maureen Darrie BSc (Hons) MRTPI

Registered in England
Number 6019666

Registered Office:
iCon Innovation Centre, Eastern Way,
Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 0QB

