

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, Arun District Council | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Raymond Cole <Raymond.Cole@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 06 April 2020 18:53

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: OUR OBJECTIONS TO: Grundon/Viridor Extended Waste Management proposals at Ford - outline planning applications pending F/4/20/OUT and the alteration of the Airfield access F/5/20PL

Please could you upload the representation below to the application folders F/4/20/OUT and F/5/20/PL as an objection received on 6 April 2020? It's mainly an objection to the proposed ERF (for which there isn't yet an application) but since the two current applications have been referenced we ought to place copies there.

Thank you

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Raymond Cole | Principal Planning Officer, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Telephone Internal: 37598 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737598 | E-mail: Raymond.Cole@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Diane Keen

Sent: Monday, April 6, 2020 6:05 pm

Subject: OUR OBJECTIONS TO: Grundon/Viridor Extended Waste Management proposals at Ford - outline planning applications pending F/4/20/OUT and the alteration of the Airfield access F/5/20PL

6th April, 2020

Dear Sir,

Grundon/Viridor Extended Waste Management proposals at Ford

We are strongly opposed to the proposals.

The planning permission of the Energy Recovery System was consented in 2015.

This further application pushes the previous boundary and no doubt in a few years there will again be further expansion citing natural progression in an area that shall be predominantly residential in nature.

The companies are taking on extra, commercial, workloads from surrounding counties, purely for profit with no obvious benefits for those within range of any contamination.

Lorry movements: is for up to 275,000 tonnes of 'non recyclable waste' waste being 'treated' (burnt) annually. This figure is almost double the amount of the existing approval of 140,000 tonnes of non recyclable waste , plus a potential further 60,00 tonnes of recyclable material, if existing figures for this are retained and not also added to.

The earlier scheme was estimated to produce a total of 240 vehicle movements each day (120 in + 120 out). This could increase to 400 lorry movements 200 out and 200 in, but could be considerably more, as no new processing figure has been given in the brochure.

What extra pollution would this invoke on our community? We must also think not only fuel but also tyre wear, brake materials as well as yet more wear and tare on our already crumbling road surfaces.

What is the type of incinerator. Make model history etc.

What power is used to convert the waste and is this carbon neutral?

What is non re-cycleable waste? Where actually would the power be sent physically?

28MW is quoted as being sufficient to power a town the size of Bognor. However, there is no mention of for how long. Is this for one day, a month or a whole year?

Likewise whilst Bognor is mentioned it is a fallacy as the document states the energy can be exported direct to the National Grid. Therefore there is no direct benefit for those in our locality. You might think that this is disingenuous.

I note that you use the term 'Energy Recovery ' quite widely in your brochure. Whilst technically accurate it might be more transparent if you called the plant what it is, an incinerator which uses the burnt waste to generate electricity. That would be more understandable to the general public, but does of course raise the issues of emission and possibly toxicity.

This figure represents an increase of about 66% on top of a traffic loading which was already considered unacceptable by local people, and would of course be in addition to the existing traffic on this road (Ford Road/Church Lane) arising from other sources.

What is the carcinogenic %. It is quoted as being within an area of 1km. In view of the high winds that we have experienced this would obviously be extended by a considerable distance, in any possible directions.

There is also HMP Ford that has a prison population of over 500 men and staff. This is very close to the ERF and inmates, staff and visitors could be at risk.

There are also other large numbers of people that collect in the area e.g. Congregations at St Mary's church, residents along Horsemere Green Lane, not to mention a large number of workers employed at the Rutford Industrial Estate.

There are also several planning applications for significant residential developments surrounding the proposed toxic incinerator.

The area of Ford, Climping, Yapton etc is all without any high rise buildings. This development is/would be out of keeping with our locality. For example the main building would be 170.6 feet high which is as tall as a 15 storey block of flats

The chimney itself would be 278.87 feet tall. as high as a 26 storey block - a skyscraper!

Just imagine the visual impact this would have over great distances of what is now mainly flat farm land or single story buildings.

In my opinion this is inappropriate for our locality and unsuited to what is essentially a rural landscape.

It will also be the largest thing to be seen when viewed from the National Park when looking towards the coast line, or from Arundel which is itself on a hill.

Bear in mind too the 1500 new residential homes planned for development on Ford Airfield immediately adjacent to this massive industrial enterprise.

It is just not appropriate!

The proposal make no mention of the proposed highway access. I presume that this is deliberate as in reality there is no suitable highway access to this site.

Church Lane is an unclassified road and is entirely unsuited to this level of heavy commercial traffic for many reasons:

- The junction of Church Lane with Horsemere Green Lane with its poor visibility is already widely known as a danger spot.
- The junction with the A259 gets heavily congested in peak hours as does the A259 itself, so Church Lane is always very congested in the evening peak with long queues forming.
- The pavement to the east of Church lane is inadequate, just try walking or cycling along it when a large vehicle sweep by. There is no footway on the east side or a pedestrian crossing.
- The use of these roads by residential traffic will increase enormously when the proposed new developments of up to 3000 new homes are completed. Yet there are no known highway proposals to deal with the extra traffic.
- Further more Horsemere Green Lane, will be chaotic! There are traffic calming islands and a reduced 30mph speed limit that few drivers comply with.
- As well as all these drawbacks the structure of the road is already crumbling and in need of frequent repair due to its use by heavy vehicles.

Further more the strategic planning on the roads system has not been thought out and implemented before increased domestic and commercial building commenced.

They need to get their act together before granting any expansion.

Finally the scheme is being added to constantly. Get this accepted and within a short time there is a further bid for expansion. In the meantime yet more residential buildings will be built, until this will no longer be a desirable area to live.

Yours faithfully

Diane & Christopher Keen
21, The Hamlet.
Waterford Gardens,
Clymping,
West Sussex. BN17 5RY.