

18 July 2017

**Waste Planning Application accompanied by an Environmental Statement
(County Matter)**

**Recycling, Recovery and Renewable Energy Facility and Ancillary
Infrastructure**

**Former Wealden Brickworks, Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, West Sussex,
RH12 4QD**

Application No: WSCC/062/16/NH

Report by Head of Planning Services

Local Member: Peter Catchpole

District: Horsham

Executive Summary

This report relates to an application for planning permission at Wealden Brickworks, Horsham, for a 'recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility' and ancillary infrastructure, creating energy from waste through thermal treatment. The facility would accept up to 230,000 tonnes of non-inert waste each year, from which an estimated 50,000 tonnes would be diverted for recycling, with the remainder thermally treated to produce energy. No increase in waste throughput or HGV movements is proposed over that already permitted for existing waste activities at the site, namely a maximum of 142 HGVs entering/leaving the site each weekday (284 HGV movements) and 70 HGVs entering/leaving the site on Saturdays (140 HGV movements).

The report provides a generalised description of the site and a detailed account of the proposed development, and appraises it against the relevant policy framework from national to local level along with other material considerations.

Horsham District Council objects to the proposal due to impact of the scale, mass and bulk of the buildings and stack on surrounding landscape and heritage assets, and their character. It also considers that noise and air quality impact assessments and proposed mitigation are inadequate.

WSCC's Landscape Architect objects to the proposal, considering it unacceptable in terms of its landscape impact, and disagree with the conclusions of the submitted assessments that the visual effects of the proposed development are all insignificant and/or controllable.

North Horsham Parish Council and Warnham Parish Council object for the following reasons: the building is too large and is visually unacceptable; unacceptable noise and air quality impacts; impact on health not fully assessed; and conflicts with the Waste Local Plan. Rusper and Colgate Parish Councils and Forest and Horsham Denne Neighbourhood Councils also object on similar grounds.

No other statutory body or WSCC consultee raise objections.

Third-party representations were received from 990 local residents and interested parties, including the local residents group (including the Langhurstwood Road Residents' Group and No Incinerator for Horsham [Ni4H]). Most representations were objecting or raising concerns to the proposal although a small number supported it. Of the 980 objecting or raising concerns, these covered the following issues: conflict with the Waste Local Plan (2014), and District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012); inappropriate location; facility too large, facility poorly designed, adverse visual impacts, impacts on local heritage assets, impacts on nearby permitted and allocated housing development; adverse impacts on highway capacity and road safety; no consideration of rail transport; adverse impacts on aviation safety, adverse impacts on the locality through lighting, dust and odour; through noise and vibration (including from associated traffic); operating hours; on nature conservation; land contamination; adverse health impacts and cumulative impacts, in the main relating to traffic impacts.

Of the 10 representations received in support, the following issues were covered: the facility would use waste, and create electricity and heat, rather than disposing of it; there is a lack of waste sites (and capacity in the county); would contribute to recycling rates; creation of local jobs; would be visually acceptable; and it would use land occupied by an existing waste site.

Consideration of Key Issues

The main material planning considerations are whether the proposal:

- accords with the Waste Local Plan, Policy W10 site allocation for the development of a built waste management facility;
- is acceptable in terms of design and landscape/visual impacts;
- is acceptable with regard to impacts on highway capacity and road safety;
- is acceptable with regard to impacts upon residential amenity; and
- is acceptable with regard to impacts upon public health.

Policy W10 site allocation

The application seeks to bring forward a waste transfer/recycling/recovery use on a site allocated in the Waste Local Plan (WLP). The principle of the use is considered acceptable, subject to meeting identified 'development principles'. In this regard, it is concluded that the proposal would accord with the 'development principles' by: being comprehensive (particularly alongside the adjacent site which forms part of the allocation); having a negligible impact on protected species; recording the site's industrial architecture for heritage purposes; retaining and improving the existing drainage infrastructure to ensure the water environment is protected; assessing the use of rail transportation to/from the site and concluding it would not be viable; and demonstrating that there would be no adverse impact on Gatwick Airport. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal is acceptable in relation to these development principles. However, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) is acceptable in terms of the impact of noise on the amenity of current and future residents contrary to Policy W10 of the WLP.

Design and Landscape/Visual Impacts

The proposal would introduce a scale of development that does not currently exist when viewed from the Surrey Hills AONB and High Weald AONB, with potentially significant adverse impacts on views from the Land North of Horsham Allocation, and Warnham Conservation Area, as well as other sites of heritage value such as a Scheduled Monument, and Registered Parks and Gardens in the locality. The development would be out of keeping with its surroundings and would represent a significant increase over existing buildings either on site or in the surrounding area. Overall, because of the poor quality design, the height and scale of the main building, the overall mass of the facility, and the height of the stack, it is considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable and significant adverse impacts on the wider landscape, the character of the surrounding area, heritage assets, and the visual amenity of local residents. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies W11, W12, W13 and W15 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), Policies SD7, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Paragraphs 17, 56, 57, 61, 115, 125, 129, 134, and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Impacts on Highway Capacity and Road Safety

No change is proposed to either the number of HGVs that can access the site under the current permission, or the permitted hours of operation. Specifically, the proposed development would result in a maximum of 142 HGVs entering/leaving the site each weekday (284 HGV movements/day) and a maximum of 70 HGVs entering/leaving the site on Saturdays (140 HGV movements). The Highway Authority considered the potential impacts on road safety and highway capacity and concluded that, subject to conditions and/or s106 legal agreement, the proposed development would not have a severe impact on the highway network in capacity or safety terms and as such accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. Taking into account the fallback position, wherein the proposal represents no change over the existing permitted use, and proposed conditional controls, the proposed development is considered acceptable with regards to highway capacity and road safety. The proposed development is considered to accord with Policies W10 and W18 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014).

Impacts on Residential Amenity

The development has the potential to result in impacts on residential amenity through noise, dust and odour. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the use, both singularly and cumulatively, would be acceptable in terms of noise impact on the amenity of current residents and the future residents of the North Horsham development would be acceptable, particularly during night time; in particular, this relates to tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in relation to potential noise impacts (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) contrary to Policies W10 and W19 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). The potential impact of HGV noise is not considered to be significant as there would be no increase in HGV movements over that which can already take place under existing permissions. It is considered that dust and odour could be adequately contained through measures such as fast-acting shutter doors and operating the building under negative pressure, as well as operational controls such as dust suppression measures and prioritising the processing of malodorous waste.

Therefore, the potential for dust and odour impact is not considered to be significant.

Impacts on Public Health

The submitted application has considered the potential impacts upon air quality and concludes them to be negligible. Although the Environment Agency and Public Health England raise no objections, the District Council's Environmental Health Officer has objected to the proposal as they consider assessments to be inadequate. However, the development would be regulated through an Environmental Permit, controlled by the Environment Agency that would require the operator to prepare a Human Health Assessment, and to demonstrate ongoing compliance with all EU and National objectives/limits for air quality. As a result, there is no reason to believe that the proposed development would not be operated in line with current pollution control techniques and standards and, therefore, there should be no public health concerns.

Conclusion

Planning permission is sought for a 'recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility' and ancillary infrastructure on a site allocated for waste purposes at Wealden Brickworks near Horsham, creating energy from waste through thermal treatment. The facility would accept up to 230,000 tonnes of waste each year, from which an estimated 50,000 tonnes would be diverted for recycling, with the remainder thermally treated to produce energy. Therefore, the development would help to drive the management of waste up the hierarchy and divert waste from landfill.

However, the proposed development, including a building of some 43.5m in height and a stack of 95m in height, would be out of keeping with its surroundings and would represent a significant increase over existing buildings either on site or in the surrounding area. The facility would be visible from a large number of viewpoints in the wider landscape and the surrounding area, some of them sensitive due to landscape and/or historic designations. Further, the impact on the North Horsham development is not considered to be acceptable. Overall, the design is of poor quality and the height, scale, and massing of the development would result in unacceptable and significant adverse impacts on the wider landscape, the character of the surrounding area, heritage assets, and the visual amenity of current and future residents.

In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the use (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) would be acceptable in terms of noise impact. The submitted assessments have been generic, and have not provided information that would demonstrate an acceptable night time impact, particularly in terms of tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise.

No increase in site throughput or HGV numbers is proposed over the existing permission for the site and, therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its potential impact on highway capacity and road safety. It is considered that controls could be put in place to ensure that dust and odour impacts were contained, and that the Environmental Permitting process would ensure that emissions to air are acceptable.

Overall, although there is a need for facilities that would divert waste from landfill,

the nature of the development proposed in this application is not considered to be acceptable in terms of its visual impact or impact on the landscape, and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the noise impact would be acceptable. Therefore, the development does not accord with the development plan or other material considerations.

Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in **Appendix 1** of the report.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report relates to an application for planning permission at Wealden Brickworks, Horsham, for a recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility and ancillary infrastructure, creating energy from waste through thermal treatment. The facility would accept up to 230,000 tonnes of non-inert waste each year, from which an estimated 50,000 tonnes would be diverted for recycling, with the remainder thermally treated to produce energy.

2. Site and Description

- 2.1 Wealden Brickworks is located within Brookhurst Wood, a large site containing various large scale uses, including Brookhurst Wood Landfill site and material biological treatment (MBT) facility (to the east and north of the application site), Warnham Brickworks (to the south), and former brickworks buildings/land to the north/north-east. The site is in the parish of North Horsham, in Horsham District (see **Appendix 2 - Site Location Plan** and **Appendix 3 - Aerial Photograph**).
- 2.2 The application site extends to some 3.8 hectares, and is currently used as a Waste Transfer Station handling inert and non-inert waste with associated open air inert waste recycling operations. It is allocated as built waste management facilities in the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), and has been in use for waste purposes since 2015.
- 2.3 The site currently includes a large former brickworks building which has been converted for waste sorting and processing use. It also contains a single storey brick building and other infrastructure including a weighbridge and office. The site is enclosed with bunds and by fencing to the east and south. It is accessed from the southern boundary, linking to the east with the wider Brookhurst Wood access road which adjoins Langhurstwood Road. The Brookhurst Wood site entrance is some 750m north of the A264.
- 2.4 The application site is located outside of the defined built-up area of Horsham which is some 900m south-east of the site, beyond the A264. The village of Warnham lies approximately 1.3km to the south-west. The Horsham to Dorking railway line abuts the western boundary of the site.
- 2.5 To the west, south and east of the wider Brookhurst Wood site are isolated and small groups of dwellings and open countryside. To the north are large industrial and commercial developments including Fisher Scientific Services and Broadlands Business Park. To the north-east is the active Graylands Clay Pit. A

cluster of commercial/industrial companies is located around Warnham station some 310m south-west of the site.

- 2.6 The closest residential properties to the operational site are at Graylands Lodge (on Langhurstwood Road) approximately 250m to the north-east; along Station Road approximately 290m to the south-west; and on Langhurstwood Road approximately 290m to the south-east.
- 2.7 In addition, outline planning permission has recently been granted (subject to legal agreement) by Horsham District Council for land east of Langhurstwood Road, a parcel of land allocated for a strategic mixed use development under Policy SD1 of Horsham District Council's District Planning Framework (the 'Land North of Horsham Allocation'). The permission is for *"Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for a mixed use strategic development to include housing (up to 2,750 dwellings), business park (up to 46,450 m²), retail, community centre, leisure facilities, education facilities, public open space, landscaping and related infrastructure (DC/16/1677)* (see **Appendix 4 - Approved North Horsham Allocation Illustrative Masterplan**).
- 2.8 If the development comes forward in accordance with the approved masterplan, the closest residential properties would be some 630m south-east of the application site, with open space some 425m south-east, a cemetery some 320m east, and a school some 850m south-east.
- 2.9 The site is some 3.3km north-west of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); some 6.4km south-east of the Surrey Hills AONB; and some 15km north-east of the South Downs National Park.
- 2.10 There are several historic features in the vicinity of the site including Graylands Moat Scheduled Monument (380m east); Warnham Conservation Area (1.1km south-west); and Historic Parksapes at Graylands (315m east), Langhurst (1km north), and Warnham Court (900m south-west).

3. Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 The site was in use for brickmaking from 1914 until the 1990s, after which it lay vacant until waste uses began in 2015. This followed the grant of planning permission on appeal in 2010 for general industrial (planning use class B2) and storage/distribution (B8) uses (ref: APP/Z3825/A/10/2141926/NWF; Horsham District Council (HDC) ref. DC/09/2355).
- 3.2 Planning permission was granted by West Sussex County Council on 1 July 2014 for a *"Waste Transfer Facility to handle inert and non-inert waste with associated open air inert waste recycling operations, landscape improvements and vehicle parking"* (ref. WSCC/018/14/NH). This was subject to a number of conditions including restricting operating hours to between 07.30 and 17.00 on weekdays and 07.30 and 13.30 on Saturdays; restricting HGV numbers to a maximum of 123 HGVs/day (246 HGV movements) on weekdays and 60 HGVs (120 HGV movements) on Saturdays; and restricting the site throughput to 200,000 tonnes/annum.
- 3.3 Various amendments to this permission have since been granted. In June 2015, permission was granted to increase the site throughput to 230,000

tonnes per annum, and increase in HGV movements to 142/day (284 HGV movements) and 70 on Saturdays (140 HGV movements)(ref. WSCC/021/15/NH). Permission was also granted to extend the hours for HGVs entering/leaving the site to between 07:00 and 18:00 on weekdays, and 07.00 and 18.00 on Saturdays.

- 3.4 In February 2016, permission was granted to vary condition 28 of WSCC/021/15/NH, allowing the *'parking and storage of vehicles, plant, machinery or equipment not required for the site operations'*, for a temporary period of two years to 3 February 2018 (ref. WSCC/077/15/NH).
- 3.5 In November 2016, permission was granted for alterations to the site's layout and to allow the outside storage of stockpiled waste and processed waste materials without the use of designated storage bays (ref. WSCC/028/16/NH).
- 3.6 These planning permissions comprise the fallback position against which the current application must be assessed. Although the current site throughput is not at its peak, there is a realistic prospect of the site being used in the future for the permitted throughput of up to 230,000 tonnes per annum and the associated impacts including noise and vehicle movements. Therefore, the potential impacts of the operation of the proposed recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility must be considered against what has already been permitted and could come forward at the site.

4. **The Proposal**

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the site to provide a built waste treatment facility comprising a materials recovery facility (MRF) for the reception and pre-treatment of waste (and which would divert material for recycling); and an energy from waste facility (EfW) which would thermally treat the residual waste to produce electricity, but also with the potential for future heat production.
- 4.2 No increase is proposed to the annual waste throughput already permitted at the site. The proposed facility would handle a maximum of 230,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial, and municipal waste per annum, as is currently the case. It is anticipated that the MRF would allow approximately 50,000 tonnes per annum of the materials received to be recycled, with the residual fraction (estimated at 180,000 tonnes per annum) processed by the EfW.
- 4.3 The facility would occupy an area of 3.29 hectares and would create 10,812 m² of new floorspace (see **Appendix 5 - Proposed Site Layout Plan**). The facility would comprise: a main building containing the MRF and EfW, with smaller buildings and ancillary development alongside.

Main Building

- 4.4 The new main building, housing the MRF and EfW, would include a tipping hall, waste processing hall, waste bunker and boiler hall, along with offices, a workshop and plant room. The main building would be approximately 119.5m in length and 99m in width, with a maximum height of 43.5m (see **Appendix 6 - Elevations (Main Building)**). It would occupy the central and western area of the wider development site.

- 4.5 The new main building would have a utilitarian, industrial appearance with a mix of curved and flat roofs of differing heights. It would have steel panelling of differing shades of grey and green, with a semi-translucent polycarbonate panel running around its centre (see **Appendix 7 - Illustrative Visualisation**).

Flue Stack

- 4.10 The facility would have a single flue stack to 95m in height and 2.5m in diameter, located at the eastern edge of the site and finished in grey (see **Appendix 8 - Proposed Sections**). Red obstacle lighting would be included at 1.5m from the stack's top to ensure its visibility to aviation traffic at all times.
- 4.11 The 95m height has been determined by computer modelling; this considers the dispersal of plumes from the stack to establish a height that would allow the optimum dispersal of flue gases. The conclusion is based on a number of parameters, including the height of the facility, emission chemistry and rate, predicted climatic conditions, and the local land topography and use (i.e. sensitivity).

Other Development

- 4.13 A number of other buildings and structures, required as part of the proposed waste treatment facility and its processes, would occupy the central, eastern and southern areas of the wider development site. These include air cooled condensers (23m height), flue gas cleaning equipment (31.5m height), a transformer unit (6.1m height), an open-fronted, covered storage/recycling building (8.8m height), sprinkler tanks (10m height) and pumphouse (3.7m height)(see **Appendix 5 - Proposed Site Layout Plan**).
- 4.14 Parking for 31 cars and one coach is proposed along the southern boundary, entered separately from the main site. Parking for seven HGVs would also be provided. A one-way circulatory site access road is proposed around the west, north and eastern perimeter of the site, with HGVs entering and exiting the site over two weighbridges. A continuous 1.8m high paladin security fence would be provided around the site's perimeter. A band of wildflower planting of around 7m in depth is proposed along the western, northern and eastern edges of the site, with existing planting along the site's northern boundary retained.

Operation of the Facility

- 4.15 As is currently the case, HGVs would enter and exit the site using the shared internal access road that connects the wider site with Langhurstwood Road. Once within the application site, all HGVs involved in waste delivery would drive along the internal access road, passing first through the weighbridge, entering the main building in its south-western corner. HGVs carrying mixed waste would deposit material in a tipping hall so recyclable material can be separated, while HGVs carrying entirely non-recyclable material would unload directly into the adjoining waste bunker.
- 4.16 Waste materials would be sorted mechanically into recyclable and non-recyclable fractions. Inert materials, plastics, and ferrous and non-ferrous metals would be separated out through the use of shredders, screens,

separators, magnets, eddy current separators and near-infra red sorting machines. The separated recyclable materials would be stored in bays outside the main building within the covered storage/recycling area in the north-eastern corner of the site. Once a sufficient quantity has accumulated, that material would be transported off-site for recycling or further use.

- 4.17 The remaining residual waste or 'feedstock' would be removed to a bunker within the main building which would be some 8m in depth. There it would be mixed mechanically to form a homogenous material with a uniform calorific value, before being transferred to a waste processing hall for shredding. The material would undergo further screening to separate any remaining metals, inert 'fines' and plastics for recycling.
- 4.18 The material would then be loaded into a feed hopper onto a moving grate for thermal treatment in the boiler hall. The furnace would be at a temperature exceeding 850°C. The movement of the grate and feeding of air into the furnace would aid combustion and reduction of solid feedstock. The process would be continuous. All waste handling and storage within the main building would be undertaken in a fully-sealed environment, with all doors closed during periods of no delivery.
- 4.19 In the event of extended maintenance periods or shutdowns, the tipping reception hall could operate solely as a transfer station, with materials sorted into recyclable/residual material and transferred off site.
- 4.20 Approximately 21MW of electricity would be generated, with a proportion used by the facility itself and the remainder exported to the national grid. The Environment Agency would control the efficiency of the facility to ensure that the process qualifies as 'recovery' (in accordance with the R1 formula, referred to in representations) and to optimise the amount of electricity available for export outside of the facility. The facility would have the potential to make use of the heat produced.
- 4.21 Gases produced during combustion would contain mostly carbon dioxide and water, though nitrogen oxides (or NOx) and trace quantities of pollutants, depending on feedstock composition, would also be produced. The gas would require treatment before being released into the atmosphere via the stack.
- 4.22 The gases would go through cleaning, filtration and neutralisation to ensure that pollutants are removed. The remaining gas would be released via the stack, which would be subject to continuous emissions monitoring.
- 4.23 Material captured in filters would be stored in sealed silos and transferred by vacuum tankers for off-site disposal or recycling. The same would apply to all solid residues, including incinerator bottom ash, produced during combustion.

Hours of Use

- 4.24 The energy from waste facility would run continuously. However, it is proposed that vehicles entering/leaving the site would be restricted to the same hours to those currently imposed through the extant planning permission, namely between 07.00 and 18.00 Monday to Friday, and 07.00 and 18.00 on Saturdays. There would be no deliveries or exports on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

HGV Numbers

- 4.25 No change is proposed to the number of HGVs permitted to access the site under the current planning permission. It is proposed that a maximum of 142 HGs would enter/leave the site each weekday (284 HGV movements), with a maximum of 70 HGVs entering/leaving the site on Saturdays (140 HGV movements).

5. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 5.1 The proposal is considered to fall within Part 10 of Schedule 1 to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (the 'EIA Regulations 2011') as it involves *'waste disposal installations for the incineration of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 100 tonnes per day'* (i.e. more than 36,500 tonnes/year). The proposal is therefore considered capable of having a significant environmental effect on the environment and so was required to be supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 5.2 On 15 December 2015, the County Council issued a Scoping Opinion confirming the information to be considered in the EIA.
- 5.3 For the avoidance of doubt, although the EIA Regulations 2011 were updated in May 2017, because the applicant had submitted an Environmental Statement before the 2017 Regulations came into force, the 2011 Regulations continue to apply.

6. Policy

Statutory Development Plan

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications are determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (as confirmed in paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the NPPF')). For the purposes of the application, the following approved or adopted planning policy documents form the statutory development plan: the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) ('HDPF') and the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014) ('WLP').
- 6.2 The key policies in the development plan that are material to the determination of the application are summarised below, and their conformity or otherwise with the NPPF considered. In addition, reference is made to relevant national planning policy guidance and other policies that guide the decision-making process and which are material to the determination of the application.

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

- 6.3 The HDPF was adopted in November 2015 and forms part of the 'development plan'. The relevant policies are: 1 (Sustainable Development), 3 (Development Hierarchy), 7 (Economic Growth), 9 (Employment Development), 24 (Environmental Protection), 25 (Natural Environment and Landscape Character), 26 (Countryside Protection), 32 (Quality of New Development), 33 (Development Principles), and 39 (Infrastructure Provision). There are also a suite of policies relating to the strategic allocation of land north of Horsham

(east of Langhurstwood Road and north of the A264) to bring forward 2500 homes and associated facilities, namely Policy SD1 (Land North of Horsham), SD2 (Employment and Business Opportunities), SD3 (Local Centre), SD5 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation), SD6 (Landscape Buffer, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure), SD7 (Design) and SD9 (Transport Infrastructure).

West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014)

- 6.4 The WLP was adopted by the County Council on 11 April 2014 and it forms part of the 'development plan'. Policy W10 allocates strategic sites, including one at Brookhurst Wood, to meet identified shortfalls in transfer, recycling and recovery capacity. It states that the allocated sites are *"acceptable, in principle, for the development of waste management facilities for the transfer, recycling, and/or recovery of waste (including the recycling of inert waste)"*. Policy W10 also states that *"the development of a site ... 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"*.
- 6.5 The supporting text to Policy W10 sets out the development principles for the allocated site:

"Brookhurst Wood, near Horsham (Policy Map 4): A brownfield site (approximately 6.5 hectares) which is allocated in Policy AL14 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework for mixed-use development including waste management. The southern part of the site (approximately 3.0 hectares) has planning permission for Class B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) uses. In theory, the allocated site has the physical capacity to deliver a single built facility (up to c.300,000 tonnes per annum) or a number of smaller facilities; however, the actual waste management capacity achieved on the site would depend upon the specific type of facility/facilities and the chosen technology or technologies".

The development principles for the Brookhurst Wood site are as follows:

- *development of the site to be comprehensive;*
- *assessment of protected species and possible mitigation required;*
- *industrial archaeological impact assessment and possible mitigation required;*
- *assessment of impacts on the water environment and possible mitigation required;*
- *assessment of impact (e.g. traffic, noise, odour) on the amenity of nearby dwellings and businesses and possible mitigation required;*
- *the cumulative impacts of traffic, noise and odour on the environment and local communities to be satisfactorily addressed and mitigated as required, taking into account all existing, permitted, allocated, or proposed development within the wider area;*
- *development to comply with Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements to ensure that the operational integrity and safety of the airport are not compromised. This may result in restrictions in height, on the detailed*

design of buildings or on development which might create a bird hazard. A bird hazard management plan may be required;

- *assessment of the possible use of rail for the movement of waste; and*
- *assessment of impact of additional HGV movements on highway capacity and road safety, including at the Langhurstwood Road/A264 junction and on the A264, A24, A23/M23, and possible mitigation required."*

6.6 Policies W11-W20 relate to development management and are designed to ensure that there would be no unacceptable harm to amenity, character, and the environment or to other material considerations from waste development proposals. Of particular relevance to the proposals are:

- Policy W11 Character: seeks to protect *'the character, distinctiveness, and sense of place of the different areas of the County'*;
- Policy W12 High Quality Developments: supports proposals for waste development which are of a high quality and take account of the need to: *"(a) integrate with and where possible enhance adjoining land uses and minimise potential conflicts between adjacent land-uses and activities;"* and have regard to the local context including the characteristics of the site and views into and out of it; and
- Policy W13 Protected Landscapes: seeks to protect the AONBs and SDNPA from 'unnecessary and inappropriate development', supporting development outside protected landscapes provided they do not undermine the objectives of the designation.

6.7 The following policies are also relevant: Biodiversity and Geodiversity (Policy W14), Historic Environment (Policy W15), Air, Soil and Water (Policy W16), Flooding (Policy W17), Transport (Policy W18), Public Health and Amenity (Policy W19), Cumulative Impact (Policy W21) and Aviation (Policy W22).

6.8 Policy W21 relates to cumulative impact and seeks to ensure that an unreasonable level of disturbance to the environment and/or local communities will not result from waste management and other sites operating simultaneously and/or successively.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

6.9 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and outlines how these are expected to be applied. The Framework is a material consideration in determining planning applications. The relevant paragraphs in the NPPF are:

14 (approving development that accords with the development plan), 17 (core planning principles), 56 (good design), 57 (high quality and inclusive design for all development), 61 (integration of new development), 103 (ensuring flood risk is not increased), 109 (contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment), 111 (effective use of brownfield land), 115 (protecting National Parks and AONBs), 120 (preventing unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability), 121 (ensuring a site is suitable for its proposed use), 122 (acceptable use of the land), 123 (health and quality of life), 124 (air quality), 125 (limit impacts of light pollution), 131-135

(taking account of the importance of heritage assets), 186 (delivering sustainable development), 187 (securing developments that improve the local economic, social and environmental conditions), 196 (determining applications in accordance with the development plan), 197 (presumption in favour of sustainable development), 203-205 (use of planning conditions and obligations to make development acceptable), and 206 (imposition of planning conditions).

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

- 6.10 The PPGs set out the Government's planning guidance to be read in conjunction with the NPPF. They do not form part of the development plan but are a material consideration in determining planning applications.

PPG: Waste (October 2015)

- 6.11 Paragraph 5 notes that local planning authorities can ensure that human health and the environment are protected through the appropriate handling of waste, in considering individual planning applications against the criteria in Appendix B of the National Planning Policy for Waste (2014),
- 6.12 Paragraph 6 notes the obligation to consider the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity in relation to waste management. Paragraph 9 notes that driving waste up the waste hierarchy, away from disposal such as landfill, is an integral part of national policy for waste and a material consideration in decisions on waste applications.
- 6.13 Paragraphs 50 and 51 note that the planning system often needs to work with other regulatory regimes. With waste planning matters, waste planning authorities usually work with the Environment Agency and the Environmental Permitting regime, which they implement and regulate.

PPG: Air Quality (updated March 2014)

- 6.14 Paragraph 5 notes that air quality may be relevant to a planning application when it would significantly affect traffic, introduce new point sources of air pollution, expose people to existing sources of air pollution, give rise to potentially unacceptable impact during construction, or affect biodiversity.
- 6.15 Paragraph 9 considers how air quality and its impacts fit into development management process.

PPG: Health and Wellbeing (updated March 2014)

- 6.16 Paragraph 2 notes that the link between planning and health is long established. It encourages local planning authorities to engage with relevant organisations when carrying out their planning function. The assessment of potential pollution and other environmental hazards, which could adversely impact on human health, should be included in considering new development.
- 6.17 Paragraph 3 notes that the first point of contact on population health and well-being issues should be the Director of Public Health, who in turn liaises with Public Health England. Paragraph 4 notes that local authority planners should consider consulting the Director of Public Health on any planning applications

(including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures.

PPG: Natural Environment (updated January 2016)

- 6.18 Paragraph 1 notes that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, while paragraph 4 notes that planning decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment and characteristics of the area. Paragraph 7 notes the statutory duty to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity, while paragraph 17 seeks to include biodiversity enhancement in and around development, including improved links between existing sites.

National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)

- 6.19 This national policy guidance document promotes, wherever possible, the use of waste as a resource and the movement of waste management up the 'waste hierarchy', thereby only supporting the disposal of waste as a last resort. It also sets out the approach waste authorities should take to determining applications.
- 6.20 At paragraph 7 it notes *"When determining waste planning application, waste planning authorities should....consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B and the locational implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies. Waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed health assessment of epidemiological and other health studies."*
- 6.21 At paragraph 7 it also notes *"When determining waste planning application, waste planning authorities should....ensure that waste management facilities are well-designed, so they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located."*
- 6.22 Appendix B sets out key criteria for testing the suitability of waste management sites, in particular; protection of water resources, land instability, landscape and visual impacts, nature conservation, conserving the historic environment, traffic and access, air emissions including dust, odours, vermin and birds, noise, light and vibration, litter, and potential land use conflict.

EU Council Directive 2008/98/EC

- 6.23 By virtue of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 when determining any application for planning permission that relates to waste management (regulation 18) the planning authority is required to take into account EU Council Directive 2008/98/EC which sets out the objectives of the protection of human health and the environment (article 13) and self-sufficiency and proximity (first paragraph of article 16(1), article 16(2) and (3)). Case law has confirmed that these articles are objectives at which to aim. As objectives they must be kept in mind whilst assessing the application and provided this is done, any decision in which the furtherance of the objectives are not achieved, may stand.

7. Consultations

- 7.1 **Horsham District Council - Planning:** Objection due to impact of the scale, mass and bulk of the buildings and stack on surrounding landscape and heritage assets, and their character. Noise and air quality impact assessments and proposed mitigation are inadequate.
- 7.2 **Horsham District Council - Environmental Health:** Objection. Assessments of noise and of air quality and odour impacts from on-site operations, on the locality, and proposed mitigation are inadequate.
- 7.3 **Environment Agency:** No objection. Seek conditions requiring Great Crested Newt Protection Plan and 5m buffer zone restricting certain works/activities around existing ponds. Sought further details regarding drainage proposals [no response received at this stage in relation to the further information provided by the applicant]. Note that an Environmental Permit would be required.
- 7.4 **Natural England:** Recommend that expert ecological and landscape advice is sought by the local planning authority.
- 7.5 **High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Unit:** Proposed building's size and form has potential for significant visual impact on the landscape, will be visible from within the AONB. If approved, seek conditions securing exterior materials and finishes using sympathetic tone and colour to aid integration into its setting, and controls on external lighting.
- 7.6 **Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Unit:** Care over the building's proposed 'grey' finish is needed to ensure that the building, when viewed from the AONB, against the backdrop of a darker landscape, could stand out if too light a grey.
- 7.7 **Historic England:** Concerns raised about the significance of Graylands Copse Moat Scheduled Monument; impact not assessed adequately or cumulatively with other proposed development in vicinity. Further information has not overcome these concerns.
- 7.8 **WSCC Landscape Architect:** Objection. The development proposed is unacceptable in terms of its landscape impact. Disagrees with the conclusions of the submitted assessments that visual effects of the proposed development are all insignificant and/or controllable.
- 7.9 **WSCC Archaeology:** No objection subject to an archaeological investigation scheme and a publicly accessible record of the site's industrial archaeology being required via condition.
- 7.10 **WSCC Drainage Strategy:** No objection subject to final technical queries and calculations related to the design of the proposed surface water drainage systems being required via condition. Foul water drainage strategy satisfactory.
- 7.11 **WSCC Ecology:** No objection. A bat sensitive lighting scheme is required via condition.

- 7.12 **WSCC Highways:** No objection. No change to HGV movements permitted at operational Transfer Station on the same parcel of land, so no further assessments or physical works required. Seek conditions/legal agreement controlling daily HGV numbers, and requiring Construction Management Plan.
- 7.13 **WSCC Tree Officer:** No objection subject to full implementation of submitted tree and root protection plan, arboricultural method statement and planting plan.
- 7.14 **Public Health England:** Provided local planning authority satisfied that installation would not contribute to significant increase in local air pollution from on-site operations, unlikely to be impact on public health.
- 7.15 **WSCC Director of Public Health:** Nothing further to add to Public Health England's response.
- 7.16 **London Gatwick Airport:** No objection. Seek bird hazard management plan, landscaping scheme and lighting scheme via condition.
- 7.17 **NERL Safeguarding:** No objection.
- 7.18 **Network Rail:** Developer should consult Network Rail's Asset Protection Scheme in advance of any development work commencing.
- 7.19 **North Horsham Parish Council:** Objection. Design, height, size and mass of the building not in keeping with local area; inadequate assessment of emissions from facility and vehicles; contrary to Horsham District Council policies, including the Land North of Horsham Allocation, and WLP policies, as well as NPPF.
- 7.20 **Warnham Parish Council:** Objection. Building too large, visually unacceptable; unacceptable noise and air quality impacts; impact on health not fully assessed; conflicts with WLP, specifically Strategic Objectives 5 [provision for new transfer, recycling and treatment facilities as close as possible to where waste arises] and 11 [conserve/safeguard the County's mineral resources] and Policies W11 [character], W12 [high quality developments] and W19 [public health and amenity].
- 7.21 **South Downs National Park Authority:** No objection.
- 7.22 **Surrey County Council:** No objection.
- 7.23 **Rusper Parish Council:** Objection. Proposal conflicts with WLP, is visually unacceptable, would create unacceptable noise and air pollution (including through HGV use), impacts on the locality, including on local wildlife and the local road network.
- 7.24 **Colgate Parish Council:** Objection. Too large for rural location, extensively visible within the locality, unacceptable levels of HGV traffic, including cumulatively, conflicts with WLP Strategic Objectives 5 and 11 and Policies W11 and W19.
- 7.25 **Forest Neighbourhood Council:** Objection. Too large, visually unacceptable, unacceptable levels of HGV traffic (inadequately assessed), noise impacts,

adverse health and safety impacts on local residents (existing and proposed), workers and visitors to the area. Any heat generated as a by-product should be used within local schemes.

- 7.26 **Horsham Denne Neighbourhood Council:** Objection. Too large, visually unacceptable, unacceptable levels of HGV traffic (inadequately assessed), noise impacts, adverse health and safety impacts on local residents (existing and proposed), workers and visitors to the area. Contrary to numerous planning policies/guidance including the Horsham District planning policies (and northern allocation), WLP and NPPF.
- 7.27 **Ockley Parish Council:** Recognises that there is a need to deal with waste locally but favours the use of small incinerators.
- 7.28 **WSCC Councillor Peter Catchpole:** Opposed to proposal and supports objections of Parish Councils, residents and protest groups. Proposal conflicts with WLP, specifically Strategic Objectives 5 and 11 and Policies W11, W12 and W19; building too large, visually unacceptable, unacceptable noise; no full assessment of air quality impact from facility and HGVs; impact on human health not fully assessed. Local residents have suffered from impact of waste development for many decades; should not import waste from all over South-East England; unacceptable levels of HGV traffic proposed.

8. Representations

- 8.1 The application was publicised in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (England) 2015). This involved the erection of eight site notices located around the application site, and advertisement in the local newspaper, and 169 neighbour notification letters and emails.
- 8.2 On 16 February 2017, the County Council issued a formal Regulation 22 request for further information and evidence in respect of the applicant's Environmental Statement (ES). This required further information relating to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment, Noise Assessment, Air Quality and Odour Assessment, Flood Risk and Drainage and Design and Scale. Information also requested for clarification purposes on Design and Scale, Noise, Air Quality, Trees and Vegetation and in relation to certain submitted Figures/Drawings.
- 8.3 Following receipt of this further information it was re-publicised and re-advertised, with all consultees, local residents and interested parties, originally consulted and those making representations, being re-consulted.
- 8.4 In total, 990 representations were received from local residents and interested parties, including the Langhurstwood Road Residents' Group, local interest groups, including No Incinerator for Horsham [Ni4H] and societies and local businesses.
- 8.5 Of these, 980 either objected or raised concerns, with the following reasons were cited: conflict with the Waste Local Plan (2014), and District Planning Framework (2015) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012); inappropriate location; facility too large, facility poorly designed, adverse visual impacts, impacts on local heritage assets, impacts on nearby permitted and

allocated housing development; adverse impacts on highway capacity and road safety; no consideration of rail transport; adverse impacts on aviation safety, adverse impacts on the locality through lighting, dust and odour; through noise and vibration (including from associated traffic); operating hours; on nature conservation; land contamination; adverse health impacts and cumulative impacts, in the main relating to traffic impacts.

- 8.6 Of the 10 received in support, the following issues were raised: the facility would use waste, and create electricity and heat, rather than disposing of it; there is a lack of waste sites (and capacity in the county); would contribute to recycling rates; creation of local jobs; would be visually acceptable and it would use land occupied by an existing waste site.

9. Consideration of Key Issues

- 9.1 The main material planning considerations are whether the proposal:
- accords with the Waste Local Plan, Policy W10 site allocation for the development of a built waste management facility;
 - is acceptable in terms of design, and landscape/visual impacts;
 - is acceptable with regard to impacts on highway capacity and road safety;
 - is acceptable with regard to impacts on residential amenity; and
 - is acceptable with regard to impacts upon public health.

Policy W10 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014)

- 9.2 The application site falls within the site allocated in Policy W10 of the WLP for the *"transfer, recycling, and/or recovery of waste (including the recycling of inert waste)"*. In identifying sites, the WLP has examined the need for waste management facilities to maintain net self-sufficiency, and taken into account the location of facilities to manage waste as close as possible to source and serve population centres. Accordingly, the principle of the use of the site for waste management purposes has been established and there is no requirement for the applicant to demonstrate a quantitative or market need for their proposal.
- 9.3 The WLP does not restrict the type of waste management facility which may be acceptable, but allocates all sites to *'meet identified shortfalls in transfer, recycling and recovery capacity'*. The present proposal would provide waste transfer, recycling and recovery (energy-from-waste) capacity. Therefore, it is acceptable in principle as it would contribute towards addressing identified capacity shortfalls for managing waste arising within West Sussex, and promote the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy.
- 9.4 Policy W10 requires that development on allocated sites must satisfactorily address the 'development principles' for that site identified in the supporting text. The following paragraphs consider the proposal against each of the nine development principles.

(1) development of the site to be comprehensive

- 9.5 The proposed development would cover approximately half of the WLP allocation site, excluding the land to the north of the site, known as Site Ha.

Planning permission has been agreed for Site Ha, subject to legal agreements being completed, for the construction of a facility to compact and bale the refuse derived fuel (RDF) produced at the adjoining Biffa Waste Services Ltd's Mechanical Biological Treatment facility (MBT)(ref. WSCC/080/13/NH).

- 9.6 The proposal would bring forward a comprehensive redevelopment of the remaining parcel of land within the WLP allocation for waste management purposes. Further, with a 230,000 tonne/annum throughput, the proposal is considered to represent a considerable contribution towards meeting identified waste capacity shortfalls identified within the WLP.

(2) assessment of protected species and possible mitigation required

- 9.7 The Environmental Statement (ES) submitted with the application includes an assessment of the potential impact on the application site's ecology and biodiversity, including protected species, and that of its nearby ecologically designated sites. This concluded that the majority of the application site has low ecological value, other than scrub areas that potentially provide habitat for great crested newts. Some scrub would be lost during the development, but would be replaced permanently afterwards; therefore, the assessment concluded that the overall impact on species and habitat would be negligible. Wildflower meadow grass would be planted around the northern, eastern and western perimeter of the site to provide 'green corridors' linking in particular with ponds to the north.
- 9.8 The WSCC Ecologist and Natural England, as well as the Environment Agency, are satisfied with the conclusions of the applicant's submitted ecological assessments, subject to conditions requiring a bat sensitive lighting scheme, a Great Crested Newt Protection Plan, and a 5m Buffer Zone restricting certain works/activities around existing ponds. Therefore, it is considered that, subject to these requirements, the development is acceptable in terms of its impact on protected species.

(3) industrial archaeological impact assessment and possible mitigation required

- 9.9 The submitted ES considers the proposed development's potential impacts upon the heritage assets of the site, primarily the remaining brickworks building that would be demolished to house the proposed waste management development.
- 9.10 The WSCC Archaeologist notes that under the requirements of previous permissions, records were taken of all of the existing buildings on the site and reported to an agreed archaeological standard; therefore, the impact on industrial archaeology is considered to be acceptable. It is considered that subject to conditions requiring the erection of an information board in relation to the industrial history of the site, a written scheme of archaeological investigation, and a publicly accessible record of the site's industrial archaeology, the development is acceptable in terms of its impact on industrial archaeology.

(4) assessment of impacts on the water environment and possible mitigation required

- 9.11 The application site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding), and is not located in a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). The submitted ES includes a Flood Risk Assessment and assessment of potential effects on local hydrology, as well as an outline strategy for managing foul and surface water discharges.
- 9.12 In general terms, it is intended to retain and/or improve, where necessary, the existing foul and surface water infrastructure following a detailed survey being carried out. As the proposals would not increase the impermeable surface area, there would be no change in run-off rates and volumes.
- 9.13 Subject to conditions to control the proposed surface and foul water drainage schemes, neither the WSCC Drainage Advisor nor the Environment Agency (EA) have raised objections to the proposals. WSCC's Drainage Advisor notes that the overall risk of surface water flooding is low, betterment is anticipated for the surface water catchment, and that the foul water drainage strategy is satisfactory. The EA notes that the Environmental Permit would contain controls on site operations, their control and containment and would regulate emissions into the water environment.
- 9.14 Therefore, it is considered that, subject to a condition requiring the submission and approval of a surface water drainage scheme, the development is acceptable.

(5) assessment of impact (e.g. traffic, noise, and odour) on the amenity of nearby dwellings and businesses and possible mitigation required

- 9.15 Discussed in detail below (see Key Issue: 'Impacts on Residential Amenity' - Paragraphs 9.51-9.66). The overall conclusion is that the applicant has *not* demonstrated that this development principle can be satisfied with regard to the impacts of noise.

(6) the cumulative impacts of traffic, noise and odour on the environment and local communities to be satisfactorily addressed and mitigated as required, taking into account all existing, permitted, allocated, or proposed development within the wider area

- 9.16 Discussed in detail below (see Key Issue: 'Impacts on Residential Amenity' - Paragraphs 9.52-9.66). The overall conclusion is that the applicant has *not* demonstrated that this development principle can be satisfied with regard to the cumulative impacts of noise.

(7) development to comply with Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements to ensure that the operational integrity and safety of the airport are not compromised. This may result in restrictions in height, on the detailed design of buildings or on development which might create a bird hazard. A bird hazard management plan may be required

- 9.17 The applicant has demonstrated that the development would comply with aerodrome safeguarding requirements, with both Gatwick Airport Limited and NERL Safeguarding confirming they are satisfied that safety would not be

compromised. Gatwick Airport Limited has asked for conditions securing the submission and approval of a bird hazard management plan, landscaping scheme and safety lighting (for the flue stack). It is, therefore, considered that this development principle can be satisfied.

(8) assessment of the possible use of rail for the movement of waste

- 9.18 The applicant has assessed the possible use of rail for the movement of waste within the submitted ES, and acknowledges that the application site is well-located with regard to the rail network, with the Horsham to Dorking railway line adjoining its western boundary.
- 9.19 However, they concluded that although there is, in theory, scope for the use of rail to move waste to the site, it is not likely to be economically viable. This is based on the scale of the proposed facility, which has been designed to predominantly serve a local need in achieving sustainable waste management infrastructure.
- 9.20 The applicant has undertaken an assessment, as required by this development principle, and has reached a conclusion which is consistent with previous assessments undertaken in relation to the wider Brookhurst Wood site. Therefore, it is considered that this development principle has been satisfied.

(9) assessment of impact of additional HGV movements on highway capacity and road safety, including at the Langhurstwood Road/A264 junction and on the A264, A24, A23/M23, and possible mitigation required

- 9.21 Discussed in detail below (see Key Issue: 'Impacts on Highway Capacity and Road Safety' - Paragraphs 9.44-9.51). The overall conclusion is that the development is acceptable in relation to this development principle.

Overall Conclusion

- 9.22 Overall, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in relation to most of the development principles that apply to the application site's allocation under WLP Policy W10. However, as set out in detail below, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) is acceptable in terms of the impact of noise on residential amenity.
- 9.23 *The application seeks to bring forward a waste transfer/recycling/recovery use on a site allocated in the Waste Local Plan (WLP). The principle of the use is considered acceptable, subject to meeting identified 'development principles'. In this regard, it is concluded that the proposal would accord with some of the 'development principles' by: being comprehensive (particularly alongside the adjacent site which forms part of the allocation)); having a negligible impact on protected species; recording the site's industrial architecture for heritage purposes; retaining and improving the existing drainage infrastructure to ensure the water environment is protected; assessing the use of rail transportation to/from the site and concluding it would not be viable; and demonstrating that there would be no adverse impact on Gatwick Airport. Therefore, it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in relation to these development principles. However, as set out below, the applicant has*

failed to demonstrate that the development (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) is acceptable in terms of the impact of noise on the amenity of current and future residents contrary to Policy W10 of the WLP.

Design and Landscape/Visual Impacts

- 9.24 The main building proposed would be significant in scale at 43.5m in height, 119m in length, with a stack to 95m in height. The applicant notes that the building needs to be this size to house various elements of the energy from waste process. This includes the grate being of sufficient length to enable full combustion, the size of the boiler providing sufficient heating surface to achieve and maintain the required steam conditions, and the need for there to be room to accommodate a beam and crane hoist above the boiler to enable removal of components.
- 9.25 The design of the building has evolved over the application process, with the building being reduced in height by 5 metres over what was originally proposed, and curves being added to its shape. However, the scale of the proposed building would still be significantly larger than either existing buildings on the application site (maximum 15m height, with c.27m high stack) and those on the adjacent MBT site (maximum height 21m, with 23.9m stack) and the adjacent Brickworks (maximum height 10m, with 27.5m high stack), which are more typical of buildings used for industrial purposes. It would, therefore, represent a significant increase in the scale of facilities on the site.
- 9.26 Further, the size of the building increases the potential area over which it may be seen and thereby increases the potential for both visual impacts (i.e. impacts on people's views) and impacts on the landscape.
- 9.27 Although the immediate area around the application site is industrial in nature, the areas to the north, west and east of the site are largely rural in character, and generally at a higher level than the application site. The site sits relatively low in the surrounding topography at 48m above ordnance datum (AOD), with a valley roughly following the railway corridor to the north and south. The land slopes up towards Leith Hill at 294m AOD, some 9.5km north-west in the Surrey Hills AONB. The land to the east of Langhurstwood Road also sits higher than the application site, including that to be developed under the Land North of Horsham Allocation. This area slopes upwards from the A264 to around 65m AOD east of the application site, sloping upwards more steeply to Graylands at 96m AOD.
- 9.28 Although immediate, close-range views of the site are limited due to the topography of the area and mature vegetation and woodland, medium and long-range views of the site are possible.
- 9.29 The applicant has considered the impact of the development in a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). This concludes that there would be no significant landscape effects either at the local or wider scale, or on any designated landscape features and character. It acknowledges that while there would be some views of the proposed development, the impact on these would not be significant. It concludes that the majority of views from close range would be well-screened with existing, mature boundary vegetation, more distant woodland, the gently undulating landscape and the site's surrounding

industrial buildings and structures; therefore, its visual prominence can be absorbed into the area within which the proposed development is located.

- 9.30 However, the WSCC Landscape Architect (LA) disagrees with these conclusions, raising major concerns regarding the impact of both the building and the flue stack which he considers would both be highly visible in the surrounding landscape, including from heritage assets and both the Surrey Hills and High Weald AONBs, with the plume from the stack drawing further attention to the overall structure.
- 9.31 The highest point of the proposed building would be above the existing mature treeline around the site so that it is not possible, within the application site, to screen it from view. Therefore, the LA does not consider that either existing or proposed planting would mitigate the landscape or visual impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area.
- 9.32 The LA also concludes that the proposal would adversely affect the setting of both AONBs, noting in relation to Leith Hill (in the Surrey Hills AONB) that the proposals would introduce a scale of development that does not currently exist in the landscape, with characteristics at odds with it. Due to the elevated position of the Surrey Hills AONB, looking down on the open flat site, the impact on it is potentially greater than on the High Weald AONB, even though the latter is closer. However, the LA notes that the development would be the only large-scale building when viewed from Roffey Park (113m AOD, within the High Weald AONB).
- 9.33 In submitting the application, the applicant agreed various 'viewpoints' with the County Council to provide a representative indication of the likely visual impact of the proposal on identified areas (though no specific viewpoint was agreed for the North Horsham Allocation area). The LA considers there would be a moderate or major adverse impact on the following viewpoints:
- Viewpoint 3: The public footpath at Moated House Farm (within the North Horsham Allocation area, 1.6km east);
 - Viewpoint 4: Roffey Park (within the High Weald AONB, 3.9km east);
 - Viewpoint 6: Warnham Court (Registered Park and Garden, adjacent to Warnham Conservation Area, 1.1km south-east); and
 - Viewpoint 11: Leith Hill Tower (within Surrey Hills AONB, 9.3km north of proposal).
- 9.34 These sites are sensitive by virtue of being within designated areas or, in the case of Moated House Farm, representing views from future occupants. Overall, therefore, it is considered that the potential impact on these areas would not be acceptable in planning terms.
- 9.35 The LA also advises that the applicant has not adequately assessed the proposal's visual impact on the Land North of Horsham Allocation. The Public Open Space and cemetery situated within the allocation's north-western area (is considered to be of high sensitivity, with the development having a significant impact on it (particularly as mitigation is not possible). The viewpoint selected by the applicant is some 1.6km from the application site, while residential properties are likely to come forward within 630m of the site. It is

not therefore considered that a true indication of the impact on the Land North of Horsham Allocation has been provided.

- 9.36 Concern is also raised by the LA, Historic England, and Horsham District Council's Conservation Officer that the applicant has not demonstrated that visual impact on the setting and character of Graylands Moat Scheduled Monument, Warnham Conservation Area and Historic Parkscapes (at Graylands, Langhurst and Warnham Court) would be acceptable.
- 9.37 Overall, the LA concludes that the proposed development exceeds the site's capacity to integrate it into the landscape. It would introduce a large-scale industrial feature into a countryside location and landscape. It would be visible from a wide area, over 9km in some locations, and from within the nearby AONBs and the Land North of Horsham Allocation. It would not be characteristic of the local landscape, introducing a large-scale, notable feature that would be frequently in view.
- 9.38 In planning terms, although the proposal is situated within an existing industrial setting and is allocated for waste management use, its size, scale and appearance would not be appropriate to the setting in landscape terms. Despite the applicant's recent changes to the proposed building, including a reduction by 5m in height and the proposed 'rounding' of building roofs and elevations, the building is still of a scale that mitigation, such as planting, cannot be used to soften its appearance and minimise its visual impact and effects on the local landscape.
- 9.39 The need for a large building is acknowledged, as is the need for facilities to divert waste from landfill, particularly on allocated sites such as this. However, this does not of itself mean that any development is acceptable. In this case the scale is considered to be excessive, and as noted by the LA, although there are large buildings within the wider Brookhurst Wood site, the proposal represents a dramatic increase in the mass, scale and height of development.
- 9.40 With regard to the design of the building, although it has improved slightly during the application process, it is not considered to represent the 'high quality design' required by planning policy (including Policy W12 of the WLP). With a building of this scale, and given the limited options for 'screening' it within the landscape, it is disappointing that the applicant has opted for a such a utilitarian, industrial appearance rather than a more organic form and design that would soften its appearance and/or a design of such architectural merit that it becomes a valued feature in its own right. Unfortunately, the present proposal achieves neither of these.
- 9.41 The design of the proposed stack seeks to limit its impact visually by using a relatively thin stack (2.5m in diameter) and using 'grey' colours to integrate it into the skyline. However, because the stack is so tall (95m), it cannot be screened from view and would become a new feature in the landscape. The visual impact of the stack would be exacerbated by the plume, particularly in cold weather when the applicant anticipates it would be up to 55.5m long at 109m in height. However, the plume would draw the eye to the stack and to the facility, exacerbating the visual impact of the development.
- 9.42 Lighting is proposed at the facility which has the potential to cause further impact on the surrounding area. However, all lighting would be directed

downward, into the site, and would be at a maximum height of 8m. It is considered that a condition could be imposed to ensure lighting is contained within the site.

- 9.43 *The proposal would introduce a scale of development that does not currently exist when viewed from the Surrey Hills AONB and High Weald AONB, with potentially significant adverse impacts on views from the Land North of Horsham Allocation, and Warnham Conservation Area, as well as other sites of heritage value such as a Scheduled Monument, and Registered Parks and Gardens in the locality. The development would be out of keeping with its surroundings and would represent a significant increase over existing buildings either on site or in the surrounding area. Overall, because of the poor quality design, the height and scale of the main building, the overall mass of the facility, and the height of the stack, it considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable and significant adverse impacts on the wider landscape, the character of the surrounding area, heritage assets, and the visual amenity of local residents. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies W11, W12, W13 and W15 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), Policies SD7, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Paragraphs 17, 56, 57, 61, 115, 125, 129, 134, and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).*

Impacts on Highway Capacity and Road Safety

- 9.44 The development has the potential for adverse impact on highway capacity and road safety, particularly as it is reliant on HGVs to transport material to and from the site along a local road (Langhurstwood Road), alongside other lorries travelling to/from adjacent large-scale waste and industrial uses at Brookhurst Wood.
- 9.45 However, no change is proposed to either the number of HGVs that can access the site under the current permission, or to the permitted hours of operation.
- 9.46 Specifically, the applicant is seeking a maximum of 142 HGVs entering/leaving the site each weekday (284 movements/day) and 70 HGVs (140 movements) on Saturday mornings. There would be no deliveries or exports on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays. The hours for delivery and export of waste and materials are proposed as 07.00-18.00 Monday to Friday and 07.00-18.00 on Saturdays.
- 9.47 These planning permissions comprise the fallback position against which the current application must be assessed. Although the current site throughput is not at its peak, there is a realistic prospect of the site being used in the future for a throughput of up to 230,000 tonnes per annum. In this case, therefore, it is not considered that the development would result in any increase in impact on the highway environment, in terms of either capacity or road safety.
- 9.48 On this basis, WSCC Highways raise no objection to the proposed development, subject to the use of a condition or legal agreement controlling daily HGV numbers and the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan.
- 9.49 The route between the site and the A264 may change as a result of the Land North of Horsham Allocation coming forward as this includes the proposal to close the Langhurstwood Road junction with the A264 and a revised A264

junction further to the east. However, the application site is already used as an operational waste facility and so its vehicle movements would have been factored in to the traffic assessments considered in granting the extant planning permissions. Further, prior to the waste use coming forward, the site was allocated for waste uses and that would have been factored into consideration of the acceptability of the North Horsham development. On this basis, it is considered that the road safety and highway capacity impact of the development on the new housing development would be acceptable.

- 9.50 Overall, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy W18 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014) and satisfy development principles (6) and (9) under Policy W10 with regard to the cumulative and singular impacts of traffic respectively.
- 9.51 *No change is proposed to either the number of HGVs that can access the site under the current permission, or the permitted hours of operation. Specifically, the proposed development would result in a maximum of 142 HGVs entering/leaving the site each weekday (284 HGV movements/day) and a maximum of 70 HGVs entering/leaving the site on Saturdays (140 HGV movements). The Highway Authority considered the potential impacts on road safety and highway capacity and concluded that, subject to conditions and/or s106 legal agreement, the proposed development would not have a severe impact on the highway network in capacity or safety terms and as such accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. Taking into account the fallback position, wherein the proposal represents no change over the existing permitted use, and proposed conditional controls, the proposed development is considered acceptable with regards to highway capacity and road safety. The proposed development is considered to accord with Policies W10 and W18 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014).*

Impacts on Residential Amenity

- 9.52 By its nature, the importation of waste in HGVs, and on-site processing involving plant and machinery has the potential to result in impacts on residential amenity through noise and odour, as well as cumulative impacts. The potential impact from emissions from the stack is considered in the following section in relation to public health impacts.

Noise

- 9.53 The proposed development has the potential to give rise to noise impacts both during construction and thereafter during operations resulting from waste activities on site, and HGV traffic.
- 9.54 The submitted ES includes an assessment of potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the development. These show that predicted noise levels resulting from operations at the main site would not exceed 55 dB at any of the closest dwellings during either day or night. The assessment concludes that, although there may be a marginal increase in noise levels at a small number of residential properties during night-time periods, the predicted levels are such that they are unlikely to be discernible or give rise to noise nuisance for residents.

- 9.55 However, Horsham District Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) does not agree with these conclusions, raising concerns about the methodologies used and evidence supporting the outcomes of the applicant's submitted noise assessment. The EHO advises that the assessment of operational sound emissions do not satisfactorily demonstrate that noise generated by the operation of the waste facility would be acceptable, particularly during the night time, and particularly tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise.
- 9.56 The assessment submitted has not considered the type of plant to be used and its characteristics; it has only considered general energy-from-waste facilities. Although the applicant may not know the specific plant to be used at this stage, a 'worst case scenario' from the options available could have been used for the assessment. Therefore, the applicant has not demonstrated that the operation of the facility would be acceptable in noise terms or that conditions could be used to require given noise levels to be maintained. This includes the impact on the amenity of current residents and on the amenity of the future residents of the North Horsham development. Furthermore, the applicant has not properly considered the cumulative impacts of noise, taking into account all existing, permitted, allocated, and/or proposed development within the wider area (contrary to development principle (6) under Policy W10).
- 9.57 The development has the potential to result in noise impacts from vehicle movements. However, no increase in vehicle movements is proposed over what can already take place on the site under existing planning permissions. The EHO raises no concerns in relation to vehicle noise. Therefore, it is not considered that the development would result in any increase in noise resulting from HGV movements.
- 9.58 The development has the potential to result in noise impacts during the construction works, particularly as they are likely to take place over three years. However, it is considered that with a condition controlling the hours of construction the impact would not be significant, particularly when compared with the noise that may result from the existing, permitted site operations, and given controls through the Control of Pollution Act. The EHO raises no concerns in this regard.

Dust

- 9.59 The proposed development has the potential to give rise to dust impacts both during construction and thereafter during operations resulting from waste handling activities on site, and HGV traffic.
- 9.60 The submitted ES includes an assessment of the potential dust impacts resulting from the development. These conclude that with most operations being contained within the main building, in contrast to currently approved operations, any impacts are unlikely to be discernible or give rise to nuisance for residents. Further, with no change to approved HGV movements, and their emissions, the applicant proposes that all loads carried in open vehicles would be secured with a net or tarpaulin, to minimise emissions of dust or debris.
- 9.61 Horsham District Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) concludes that with HGV numbers remaining the same and the site not being situated near or within any Air Quality Management Areas, subject to a dust management plan being imposed by condition to cover both construction and operation of the

facility it is not considered that that the development would result in an unacceptable impact through dust emissions.

Odour

- 9.62 The proposed development involves the processing and storage of a mix of commercial/industrial and municipal waste, which may include some biodegradable and other potentially odorous material. Due to the need to maintain a feedstock for the combustion process, the waste would be retained for a period of around three days, increasing the potential for odour impacts.
- 9.63 The applicant has submitted an outline Odour Management Plan that sets out the likely measures to control fugitive odour emissions including fast acting roller shutter doors, negative pressure within buildings, operational controls over waste storage (e.g. prioritisation of malodorous waste), cleaning, and site monitoring. Conditions could be added securing the measures set out in this Plan. Further, the Environment Agency has confirmed that they would regulate odour arising at the site under Environmental Permitting Regulations.
- 9.64 To ensure HGVs travelling to/from the site do not result in odour impacts, a condition could be added requiring that HGVs entering and exiting the site are covered or sheeted.
- 9.65 It is considered that subject to these measures the development is acceptable in terms of odour impact.
- 9.66 *The development has the potential to result in impacts on residential amenity through noise, dust and odour. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the use, both singularly and cumulatively, would be acceptable in terms of noise impact on the amenity of current residents and the future residents of the North Horsham development would be acceptable, particularly during night time; in particular, this relates to tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in relation to potential noise impacts (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) contrary to Policies W10 and W19 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), and paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). The potential impact of HGV noise is not considered to be significant as there would be no increase in HGV movements over that which can already take place under existing permissions. It is considered that dust and odour could be adequately contained through measures such as fast-acting shutter doors and operating the building under negative pressure, as well as operational controls such as dust suppression measures and prioritising the processing of malodorous waste. Therefore, the potential for dust and odour impact is not considered to be significant.*

Impacts on Public Health

- 9.67 A large number of representations have raised concerns about the impact of the EfW on health, particularly in relation to emissions from the stack. In general locational terms, the development site lies in an area where existing background air pollutant concentrations are well below Air Quality Objectives, and there are no Air Quality Management Areas in the locality.

- 9.68 The need to protect human health is identified in paragraph 109 of the NPPF which recognises that the planning system should prevent new development from contributing to or causing unacceptable risk through air pollution. Similarly, paragraph 2 of PPG: Health and Wellbeing recognises the need to consider the potential for pollution that might lead to an adverse impact on human health. Paragraphs 3 and 4 note that where any planning applications are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it, the first point of contact on population health and wellbeing issues should be the Director of Public Health, who in turn liaises with Public Health England.
- 9.69 The principal health concerns raised by third parties and consultees relate to emissions arising from the combustion of waste, and the resultant impacts upon air quality. The combustion process would be undertaken within a fully-sealed unit (the boiler hall), after which the hot 'flue' gases would be subsequently cooled and the steam produced then superheated and used to generate electricity, through turbines. All exhaust gases would go through a process of cleaning, filtration and treatment before being emitted from the flue stack. The Environmental Statement notes that at each stage of the process, controls would be in place to minimise emissions, including continual monitoring, usually available as a live feed to the Environment Agency, and an automatic shutdown system.
- 9.70 The submitted application includes an Air Quality Assessment that considers potential impacts to air including an assessment of baseline conditions, potential emissions, dispersion modelling, and likely significance of impacts. The assessment concludes that the potential impacts to air would be low to negligible.
- 9.71 Detailed consideration of the implications of waste management processes for human health is the responsibility of the Environment Agency (EA), which carries out pollution control responsibilities through the Environmental Permitting regime. The EA raises no objection to the proposals and notes that a bespoke Environmental Permit will be required to regulate emissions to air, land and water, and to ensure that the plant is operated to Best Available Techniques (BAT). Further, as part of any application for an Environmental Permit, the EA would require a Human Health Assessment to be undertaken, and would consult with Public Health England (PHE) who would make specific observations and recommendations for conditions, during that process. By virtue of the EA position of 'no objection', there is no reason to believe that the development could not fulfil the requirements of any subsequent Environmental Permit.
- 9.72 Public Health England (PHE) was consulted on the proposal and conclude that *"Provided that the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the installation will not contribute to a significant increase in local air pollution (from on-site operations), there is unlikely to be an impact on public health from this installation"*. Given that controls over the emissions from the stack are within the remit of the Environment Agency, it is considered that the County Council can be reassured that this is the case, and that no increase in local air pollution would result from the facility.
- 9.73 The Horsham District Council EHO objects to the conclusions of the applicant's Air Quality Assessment, which they consider to be inadequate. However, where

controls are in place through other regulation, it is not appropriate to require controls or mitigation through the planning process. In this instance, the Environmental Permitting regime provides regulation of the emissions to air, and would ensure that the facility complies, on an ongoing basis, with the relevant national and EU standards for air quality. Therefore, although the EHO's concerns are noted, it is considered that the matters raised would be addressed through the Environmental Permitting process.

- 9.74 Overall, therefore, it is considered that there are sufficient controls through the Environmental Permitting process to ensure that the development would not result in unacceptable impacts on air quality or as a result, impacts on human health.
- 9.75 *The submitted application has considered the potential impacts upon air quality and concludes them to be negligible. Although the Environment Agency and Public Health England raise no objections, the District Council's Environmental Health Officer has objected to the proposal as they consider assessments to be inadequate. However, the development would be regulated through an Environmental Permit, controlled by the Environment Agency that would require the operator to prepare a Human Health Assessment, and to demonstrate ongoing compliance with all EU and National objectives/limits for air quality. As a result, there is no reason to believe that the proposed development would not be operated in line with current pollution control techniques and standards and, therefore, there should be no public health concerns.*

10. Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

- 10.1 Planning permission is sought for a 'recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility' and ancillary infrastructure on a site allocated for waste purposes at Wealden Brickworks near Horsham, creating energy from waste through thermal treatment. The facility would accept up to 230,000 tonnes of waste each year, from which an estimated 50,000 tonnes would be diverted for recycling, with the remainder thermally treated to produce energy. Therefore, the development would help to drive the management of waste up the hierarchy and divert waste from landfill.
- 10.2 However, the proposed development, including a building of some 43.5m in height and a stack of 95m in height, would be out of keeping with its surroundings and would represent a significant increase over existing buildings either on site or in the surrounding area. The facility would be visible from a large number of viewpoints in the wider landscape and the surrounding area, some of them sensitive due to landscape and/or historic designations. Further, the impact on the North Horsham development is not considered to be acceptable. Overall, the design is of poor quality and the height, scale, and massing of the development would result in unacceptable and significant adverse impacts on the wider landscape, the character of the surrounding area, heritage assets, and the visual amenity of current and future residents.
- 10.3 In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the use (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) would be acceptable in terms of noise impact. The submitted assessments have been generic, and have not provided information that would demonstrate an acceptable night time impact, particularly in terms of tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise.

- 10.4 No increase in site throughput or HGV numbers is proposed over the existing permission for the site and, therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its potential impact on highway capacity and road safety. It is considered that controls could be put in place to ensure that odour impacts were contained, and that the Environmental Permitting process would ensure that emissions to air are acceptable.
- 10.5 Overall, although there is a need for facilities that would divert waste from landfill, the nature of the development proposed in this application is not considered to be acceptable in terms of its visual impact or impact on the landscape, and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the noise impact would be acceptable. Therefore, the development does not accord with the development plan or other material considerations.
- 10.6 In considering the application, the County Council has, through consultation with the appropriate statutory bodies and having regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, considered the objectives of protection of human health and the environment and self-sufficiency and proximity as required by Article 18 of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.
- 10.7 It is **recommended**, therefore, that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in **Appendix 1** of this report.

11. **Resource Implications and Value for Money**

- 11.1 This is not a material planning consideration and cannot, therefore, be considered in determining this application. There will be no requirement for additional resources unless the decision is challenged and there is a requirement to defend the County Council's position at any subsequent appeal.

12. **Equality Duty**

- 12.1 The County Council has a duty to have regard to the impact of any proposal on those people with characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Officers considered the information provided by the applicant, together with the responses from consultees and other parties, and determined that the proposal would have no material impact on individuals or identifiable groups with protected characteristics. Accordingly, no changes to the proposal were required to make it acceptable in this regard.

13. **Risk Management Implications**

- 13.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. If this is not done, any decision could be susceptible to an application for Judicial Review.

14. **Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 14.1 This decision has no implications in relation to crime and disorder.

15. Human Rights Act Implications

- 15.1 The Human Rights Act requires the County Council to take into account the rights of the public under the European Convention on Human Rights and prevents the Council from acting in a manner which is incompatible with those rights. Article 8 of the Convention provides that there shall be respect for an individual's private life and home save for that interference which is in accordance with the law and necessary in a democratic society in the interests of (inter alia) public safety and the economic wellbeing of the country. Article 1 of protocol 1 provides that an individual's peaceful enjoyment of their property shall not be interfered with save as is necessary in the public interest.
- 15.2 For an interference with these rights to be justifiable the interference (and the means employed) needs to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised. The main body of this report identifies the extent to which there is any identifiable interference with these rights. The Planning Considerations identified are also relevant in deciding whether any interference is proportionate. Case law has been decided which indicates that certain development does interfere with an individual's rights under Human Rights legislation. This application has been considered in the light of statute and case law and the interference is not considered to be disproportionate.
- 15.3 The Committee should also be aware of Article 6, the focus of which (for the purpose of this committee) is the determination of an individual's civil rights and obligations. Article 6 provides that in the determination of these rights, an individual is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal. Article 6 has been subject to a great deal of case law. It has been decided that for planning matters the decision making process as a whole, which includes the right of review by the High Court, complied with Article 6.

Michael Elkington

Head of Planning Services

Contact: Sam Dumbrell telephone 0330 222 6947.

Background Papers

As set out in Section 6.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 - Reasons for Refusal

[Appendix 2 - Site Location Plan](#)

[Appendix 3 - Aerial Photograph](#)

[Appendix 4 - Approved North Horsham Allocation Illustrative Masterplan](#)

[Appendix 5 - Proposed Site Layout Plan](#)

[Appendix 6 - Elevations \(Main Building\)](#)

[Appendix 7 - Illustrative Visualisation](#)

[Appendix 8 - Proposed Sections](#)

Appendix 1: Reasons for Refusal

1. By virtue of the poor quality design and the scale, mass, and height of the proposed facility, including the height of the stack, the development would result in unacceptable and significant adverse impacts on: the wider landscape (including on the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty); the character of the surrounding area; heritage assets; and the visual amenity of current residents and the future residents of the North Horsham development. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to: Policies W11, W12, W13 and W15 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014); Policies SD7, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015); and Paragraphs 17, 56, 57, 60-67, 115, 129, 134, and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
2. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the noise from the operation of the proposed facility (both singularly and cumulatively with other development) would not have a significant adverse impact on current residents and the future residents of the North Horsham development. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to: Policies W10 and W19 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014); Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015); and Paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).