		, , ,
ı	Application number	WSCC/036/20
	Name	Tom Baker
	Address	14 Dedmere Rd Marlow SL7 1PG
	Type of Comment	Objection
		You have failed to take the allocation of 1500 houses as part of a mixed development at Ford Airfield into consideration, apart from where it alters the Traffic Baseline to suit your position. The height, bulk and mass of the building and chimney are such that they could prejudice the viability of this allocation and the applicant's report on this matter is from an entirely different location and building and is

You have failed to take the allocation of 1500 houses as part of a mixed development at Ford Airfield into consideration, apart from where it alters the Traffic Baseline to suit your position. The height, bulk and mass of the building and chimney are such that they could prejudice the viability of this allocation and the applicant's report on this matter is from an entirely different location and building and is therefore irrelevant. This would put pressure on Arun to find other less suitable sites for housing development. 2. The Height, Mass and Bulk of this proposal, would be a seriously detriment to the aspect and setting of Listed Buildings including the Grade 1 Listed St Andrews Church the setting and environment of the SSSI at Clymping Beach the setting of Arundel and the Arun Valley The significant viewpoints mentioned by SDNP landscape study at both Monarch's Way and the Trundle and other prominent views in and out of the National Park and therefore against the NPPF The application does not demonstrate in the Landscape Assessment these important views. 3. There is no evidence supplied as to why the existing design would no longer be possible to act as an ERFW. There is no justification as to why this location needs to take more waste than it already has through its implemented permission, particularly now that the Horsham site has been permitted. 4. Unlike the implemented permission this application is not for an R1 Gasification Process and this application therefore inherently a retrograde proposal for a more polluting and less energy efficient system. https://www.wastetoenergysystems.com/why-is-justification/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incineration/#stetter-than-incinera

incineration/#:~:text=Incineration%20is%20defined%20as%20high,be%20disposed%20of%20in%20landfills.&text=Gasification%20is%20a%20high%20temperature,to%20a%20gas%20called%20syngas.

5. The Application is contrary to many Policies in the NPPF and WSCC Mineral and Waste Plan, through its flawed Environmental Statement as well as against the new settlement policies with Arun DC Local Plan and the Ford Neighbourhood Plan.

Received

07/08/2020 16:03:32

Comment for planning application WSCC/036/20

Attachments