

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Sam L"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="Lyminster"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

Comments

This application is clearly an emotive issue for many local people. Sometimes with significant applications, the applicant can benefit from objector fatigue, however looking at the web file it is very clear that the public and surrounding residents overwhelmingly object to this proposal for a variety of reasons. The proposal must be considered on planning merit, that is to say whether it is acceptable and the benefits and mitigation outweigh the harm caused. The site is safe guarded for waste uses, which is accepted, however what is not considered acceptable is how it can be conceived that the benefits or mitigation will outweigh the significant harm caused. The landscape visual impact assessment sets out agreed points of observation with the statutory consultees at approximately 10-12km from the site. The decision maker must not lose sight of the fact that just because these points are agreed, it does not mean the scheme will not be seen from further away or affect the longer distance views. This is evidenced by the Rampion 1 wind turbines (85m tall), some 8-13km offshore at Worthing that are clearly visible from the South Downs Park above Goodwood, to the north of Chichester. The two 85 meter stacks and plume could easily be visible from a far greater distance, let alone the negative impact it has on the historic built environment of Arundel or the Arun Valley and let us not forget the potential power lines and pylons that will be required to run for several miles to connect this scheme to the National grid. Have the impact of these pylons been considered in the context of Arundel, the Arun Valley and the coastal plain? The perceived benefits of the scheme are employment, energy creation in the form of heat and electricity and disposing of waste. Employment The creation of jobs from a 10 acre site, that is already allocated and safe guarded for waste uses, should not be given significant weight. The fact that West Sussex CC have allocated the site, in itself provides that the scheme is suitable for employment uses. It is worth noting that there is a shortage of employment land within the district, and the site could easily come forward for alternative uses and provide employment. Heat creation As yet the general public have not been made aware of any schemes that will benefit from the heat as a by-product. The housing scheme immediately adjacent is not interested in the heat energy and the secondary school is a long way from being secured, and therefore without a use for this heat how can it be a perceived benefit. It should not therefore be given any weight as a benefit of the scheme. Electricity The production of electricity, whilst this is a benefit of the scheme, it should not be given significant weight in the view of the following. Successive Governments striving to produce more sustainable forms of energy, this project would be in the top three of Carbon dioxide production in the creation of energy alongside burning fossil fuels. The wider environmental impact that the production and emission of noxious gases from this scheme that will be dispersed into the atmosphere. In the context of Rampion 1 and 2, both local projects that will provide enough electricity for 1.35 million homes per year and a reduction of Carbon dioxide of 2.6 million tonnes per year. Rampion 1 - 350,000 homes - Carbon Dioxide reduction = 600,000 tonnes Rampion 2 - 1 million homes - Carbon Dioxide reduction = 2 million tonnes This is far greater energy production at far less cost. Disposal of Waste Prevention of waste going to landfill is a benefit. However it is hardly in keeping with the concept of recycling, In summary, Employment, Heat and Energy creation should be afforded less than significant weight in the circumstances, whilst the prevention of waste going to landfill could be afforded moderate weight. On balance the perceived benefits do not outweigh the significant harm or cost caused in terms of Carbon Dioxide production, damage to the Heritage and Setting of the built environment, the natural environment of the Arun Valley, as well as the damage to the atmosphere and environment of the emission of noxious gases. All of this before you consider the impact of the transport movements and further Carbon Dioxide production within the local villages of Ford, Climping, Yapton, Walberton, Wick, and Lyminster as the trucks seek to access a trunk road. Mitigation Currently the applicant proposes to build an earth bund with acoustic fencing and planting to screen the scheme, alongside a small water feature, some blue parking spaces to denote the alignment of the former canal and some educational opportunities. The impact of this scheme in this location is so significant that a great deal of mitigation should be required before it could be reasonably considered, to outweigh the costs. For instance bridging the Ford railway crossing as well as providing significant funding to the connection of the Ford Road to the Arundel bypass. On this analysis alone, it is hard to see how West Sussex CC, can grant a consent for this scheme. This is not to say that the site is not suitable for waste uses, but the current proposal is clearly not suitable and should be refused. In various Local Advisory Group meetings and Public Consultations the applicants have tried to assert that the competing scheme at Horsham, W.Sussex may not come forward, and that if planning permission were achieved at Ford, then it would be a commercial decision for Grundon's and Viridor to decide as to whether or not it was viable to bring the scheme forward. We know that Britannia Crest at Horsham is in the process of implementing their successful application, which suggests it is coming forward.

Even if the Horsham site does not come forward, there is another site dealing with this type of waste in a far more eco friendly way at Alton, Hampshire. This detracts from the fact that with the Horsham site for all intents and purposes coming forward, this application is premature. Why would West Sussex CC choose to place the decision making in the hands of commercial operators, when they could clearly refuse this application, and encourage a waste use on this site which was more sustainable in so many ways that could actually be supported by the community, which doesn't have such a significant impact on the wider environment.

Received

16/05/2021 21:48:43

Attachments