

Comment for planning application WSCC/036/20

Application number	WSCC/036/20
Name	Jenny Betteridge
Address	CHURCH FARM HOUSE EAST, CHURCH LANE, CHURCH LANE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 5RB
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>My objections are: 1. The scale and appearance of the building is out of keeping and character of the surrounding area. The applicant is right to state in their environmental statement that the industrial building, chimney stack and plume will introduce industrial elements into the landscape where none exists. But the applicant is wrong to claim that the chimney, plume and building 'will add {a} landmark feature of interest, contributing to a landscape that lacks distinctiveness.' Such a statement by the applicant fails to appreciate the character & features of the lowland coastal plain of the Arun Valley e.g. views to the South Downs (a National Park), views across to Iron Age structures such as Cissbury Ring and Highdown Hill, views to the historic town of Arundel & its grade 1 listed castle. Currently, the visually dominant buildings on the floodplain are vernacular church towers of Climping, Ford, Yapton & Lyminster which are 800 years old and Grade 1 listed. Yet the applicant's environmental statement claim that their huge industrial buildings & a chimney higher than Chichester cathedral spire and 7 times higher than Climping Church tower will improve that landscape by adding what they call 'interest' & 'distinctiveness'. The applicant's claim is wrong. 2. Impact on listed buildings & their settings. The applicant's environment statement is correct that the impact on the Grade 1 listed St Andrew's Church at Ford will be 'substantially significant.' The setting will be destroyed. The huge industrial building, chimney stack & plume will also destroy the setting of the Grade 1 listed St Mary's Church at Climping & Grade 1 listed St Mary's Yapton as these currently only have low rise buildings in their vicinity largely hidden behind trees. 3. Negative impact on residential amenity. The applicant's environment statement admits that they took no assessments of the visual impact on 'residential receptors from homes.' Yet the application claims the building, chimney stack and plume will be a 'positive, large scale landmark.' Local residents disagree. 4. It will negatively affect the local economy, especially tourism and Ford market, resulting in job losses. These will not be offset by the additional 16 jobs the applicant promises to bring to the area. 5. Negative environmental impact of making the site a regional waste site for south east England and beyond. Environmental degradation will be an inevitable consequence of the applicant's stated aim to transport the household, industrial & commercial waste of the cities of Portsmouth, Southampton and Brighton and the counties of Surrey, Hampshire & East Sussex by HGV to a rural area inside West Sussex miles from any West Sussex County boundary. 6. Carbon impact The applicant's carbon impact assessment is misleading as it compares the application with the current operations at the site. The site's current operations involves all the waste which is trucked into the site by HGV also being trucked out of the site by HGV after it has been sorted into different waste categories. This application to incinerate 30% of waste will mean the waste and ash trucked away from the site will be less than that taken in. Thus reducing the pattern of HGV carbon impact compared with today's operations. This is a false comparison. The carbon impact assessment comparison should be with the waste gasification plant West Sussex County Council granted Grundon planning permission for in 2015 for this site but which Grundon did not bother to build. The waste gasification plant would have reduced the amount of waste being trucked away from the site and the carbon impact of transport.</p>
Received	31/07/2020 18:48:37
Attachments	