

**Michael Elkington**  
Strategic Planning Manager

Please respond to: James Neave  
Tel: (+44) 0330 2225571  
[james.neave@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:james.neave@westsussex.gov.uk)  
[www.westsussex.gov.uk](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk)

**County Planning**

County Hall  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RH

Tel: 01243 642118



Mr Steve Molnar  
Technical Director,  
Terence O'Rourke Ltd,  
Everdene House,  
Deansleigh Road,  
Bournemouth,  
BH7 7DU

2 July 2021

Dear Mr Molnar,

**Application Number:** WSCC/011/21  
**Address:** Ford Circular Technology Park, Ford Road, Ford, Arundel BN18 0XL.  
**Proposal:** Demolition of existing buildings and structures and construction and operation of an energy recovery facility and a waste sorting and transfer facility for treatment of municipal, commercial and industrial wastes, including ancillary buildings, structures, parking, hardstanding and landscape works

**Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**

**The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017**

**Regulation 25 Further Information and Evidence Respecting Environmental Statements**

I refer to the above application and write, in accordance with Regulation 25 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, to formally request that further information be submitted to West Sussex County Council ("the Council").

The submission of the following information is seen to be essential further information in respect of the application to verify the particulars of the submitted development proposals, and to enable proper consideration of the likely environmental effects. Notwithstanding any further information that may later be deemed necessary, the following information/clarifications will be required to enable the Council to determine the application.

The following request sets out key information sought by officers, supplemented by that sought from selected consultees. You will note in some cases that only selected additional information or clarifications sought by consultees has been requested and/or rationalised. This is the further information considered necessary to verify environmental effects.

Notwithstanding this, as noted below, you are encouraged to address consultees queries or respond to their comments in full. Each consultee response is available on the County Council's website [here](#).

Where consultees are not listed below, this is because they have not requested additional information to enable consideration of the environmental effects. This does not mean they have not commented on the application and given their advice, including in some instances, their grounds for objection.

You will note that there is some overlap in the information requested by different consultees and that of officers. In such instances it may be appropriate to provide a single response where two or more requests for the same information has been made.

In addition, I have listed additional information that is requested in support of the planning application, but not requested under Regulation 25.

If you consider that the requested information has already been submitted, please provide details of where in the submitted information it can be found. Further, if you consider such matters have already been assessed, please provide detailed justifications as to why further information is not necessary in the context of recognised best practice/guidance.

### **Further information/Clarifications Sought**

- Clarify Proposed boundary treatments. Heights and finishes should be annotated on the submitted 'Fencing Layout' Plan for ease of reference. Further, submitted 'Site Elevation' Plans do not appear to detail the proposed 'Palidin' fencing. Plans should also clarify the proposed finish of the timber acoustic fence (understood to be stained dark grey). Please clarify and update accordingly.
- A hard-landscaping plan is required.
- Whilst it is noted that 'high levels of glazing will be fitted with blind systems which will close during the hours of darkness', clarification is sought of the areas of glazing where this would be applied, and the proposed mechanisms to secure this (e.g. ensure automatic closing rather than being dependent on manual closing).
- Diesel and Water Treatment facilities are detailed on the 'Proposed Site Layout' Plan, but do not appear on the associated elevation plans. Please clarify and update accordingly.
- Design and Access Statement – The Shadow Plans are seemingly incorrectly labelled – Please clarify.
- Address inconsistency in planting proposals between the proposed Landscaping Plan (Softworks General Arrangements Plan) and Proposed Site Plans. Also clarify which version of landscaping has been considered in the assessment of visual effects, visualisations, and BNG calculations.
- Visualisation view 36 (Environmental Statement (ES) - Chapter 12) appears to be missing. Please provide.
- Clarify if (or which) visualisations have included the proposed bunds and/or landscaping. Where landscaping has been shown in visualisations, please indicate at what year of growth this has been represented.
- Clarify the total volume of material to be excavated, and whether this material would be stored/re-used on site or removed (and to where). Further clarify the total volume and likely specification of imported fill material for proposed bunds. In both cases, please clarify whether HGV movements associated with removal/delivery of such materials has been considered in anticipated construction HGV numbers/associated impacts.

- ES Paragraph 3.98 suggests some HGV deliveries outside the hours of 06:00-20:00 Monday-Friday and 08:00-18:00 Saturdays to avoid traffic or prevent build up in WSTF. Please clarify the frequency and likely timings of such movements (which would exceed that specified by the extant permission at the site).
- ES Paragraph 3.104 suggests some 122 HGV deliveries (244 movements) is sought. Please clarify why this exceeds that currently permitted by the extant permission at the site/provide an explanation of this.
- Clarify whether doors would remain closed when deliveries are not taking place (i.e. via fast acting roller shutter doors) for both the ERF and WSTF. ES paragraph Para 3.129 suggests this may not be the case, at the WSTF. Please also clarify if the WSTF would be subject to negative pressure. Clarify how this has been considered in conclusions on operational odour impacts.
- Clarify the reduction in decibels assumed for boundary screening at ES paragraph 14.97 (bunds and fencing), and whether this accounts for varied heights of the bund.
- Clarify consideration given to noise, dust and odour impacts upon neighbouring sports fields (existing and future).
- Clarify what consideration has been given to noise, dust and odour impacts upon future proposed employment uses immediately to the east, as included within the current Arun District Council planning application F/4/20/OUT (relating to the neighbouring Arun Strategic Development site).
- ES Chapter 14, Noise levels for Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CTRN). It is not clear how/if this assessment takes into account the size of HGVs and whether this could lead to different conclusions. Further, Table 14.13 seemingly suggests that the construction traffic noise assessment only considers two receptors, and not the full range of receptors as has been assessed for road traffic noise during operation (Table 14.17) and thus may omit consideration of properties located closer to the carriageway (e.g. south of Horsemere Green Lane). Please clarify.
- ES Chapter 14 does not appear to draw any conclusion on the potential for road traffic vibration impacts upon nearby properties (in particular those closest to the haul routes and on Ford Road/Church Lane). Please clarify.
- Clarify what has been determined as a 'short-term' impact in consideration of construction related impacts. Given the anticipated duration of the proposed construction period, and proposed delivery of screening bunds as a final phase of works, further information/clarification is sought as to the consideration given to the potential impacts of the development (e.g. noise/dust/lighting/visual) upon neighbouring receptors (both existing and future), until such time as proposed screening bunds, acoustic barriers, and landscaping have been constructed/implemented. This should include consideration of both the WSFT (completed at month 7 of the 51-month construction programme) and ERF (which would seemingly be in operation prior to completion of landscaping). This should also explain how potential in combination effects with concurrent construction and operational activities during this period has been taken into account in the supporting assessments, including details of any mitigation assumed.

Further, it is recommended that Plans setting out the five key construction phases (as detailed in Outline CEMP, Section 2) be provided to offer a visual representation of the phases, and highlight any physical mitigation measures proposed in advance of proposed screening bunds, acoustic barriers, and landscaping being constructed/implemented.

- ES paragraph 14.167 suggests that if adopting the same (now superseded) standards for calculated specific noise levels, the required threshold noise level conditioned by the extant permission WSCC/096/13/F (35 dB(A)), would be achieved by the proposed development at each existing receptor location. Please clarify is this would also be the case for future proposed receptors (i.e. R5 & R6 – ‘The Landings’). It would be useful if Noise Contour Maps consistent with those produced as part of the WSCC/096/13/F could be provided to enable a direct spatial comparison of noise impacts from the now proposed scheme compared with the extant scheme.
- Clarify what mitigation (including any physical features) has been assumed in the noise contours provided in ES Chapter 14, Figures 14.6 – 14.15 (i.e. both for construction and operational noise impacts).
- With reference to comments of Barton Wilmore dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021 (on behalf of Wates Developments Ltd and Redrow Homes (Southern Counties) Ltd) clarification and/or explanations are sought with regard to the reasons for (a) the difference in measured background noise levels, and (b) the differences in baseline traffic data, as have been measured/presented in the current Arun District Council Planning application F/4/20/OUT (relating to the neighbouring Arun Strategic Development site).
- Consideration must be given to potential odour impacts upon future receptors (i.e. R5 & R6 – ‘The Landings’) which are seeming omitted from the operational odour impact assessment.

### **WSCC Highway Authority**

- Details and an estimate of a proportionate contribution required to deliver opportunities to improve pedestrian and cycle access in the locality as set out in the WCHAR.
- Provide of a Word copy of the designers’ response.
- Further information on the occurrence of peak days (no peak day assessment has been provided as per the previous withdrawn application, where the maximum consented HGV movements were included).
- Consideration of Church Lane vehicular movement construction impacts and various options proposed.
- Vehicle tracking information for the largest anticipated vehicles at the Church Lane junction.
- Clarify HGV parking numbers.
- Clarify the anticipated number of days/occurrences that previously consented maximum daily HGV numbers are envisaged to be exceeded, and any further mitigating action to be taken.

### **WSCC Landscape**

The Council’s Landscape Consultant has requested the following additional information:

- Landscape General Arrangement Plan 2829-01=001 Rev D does not appear to show planting proposals consistent with indicative landscaping shown on Proposed site plans PL04, PL05, PL106 and PL107. Please clarify and amend as necessary.

- More detail of proposed materials and appearance of the proposed underpass at the north eastern corner is required.
- A hard-landscaping plan is required showing proposed surfaces.
- Details of how lighting will be controlled and minimised from office windows.
- Clarify the criteria with respect to assessment of visual effects on views, and what warrants the downgrading of the magnitude of change from high to medium/high.

## **Arun District Council Environmental Health Officer (EHO)**

### General

- Clarify potential noise nuisance from the site once commissioned but before the earth bunds have been constructed and mitigation proposed.
- Clarify the volume and frequency of HGV movements outside of normal working hours stipulated.
- Clarify potential noise impacts associated with the proposed use of an emergency generator during abnormal operating conditions (including details of location and frequency of use).

### Air Quality

- Clarify the extent to which likely vehicle movements associated with proposed new homes has been taken into account in assessment of air quality impacts.
- Clarify if air quality monitoring/modelling is based on current vehicle numbers or maximum permitted by extant permissions.
- Clarify what consideration has been given to potential changes in air quality objectives and how/if the plant would address this to ensure future compliance.
- Section 6.93 of the report states that "the point of maximum impact occurs to the north east of the ERF on a small section of Station Road (i.e. an area where the annual mean AQAL does not apply)." Clarify why the AQAL does not apply here as there are several residential properties here around the junction with Ford Lane that have not been identified as sensitive receptors.
- Emissions Mitigation Statement: Clarify the basis for calculation of the mitigation costs

### Odour and Dust

- Clarify location of nearest sensitive receptors to north east considered.
- Clarify consideration given to proximity to potential future sensitive receptors within the neighbouring strategic development site for dust and odour, and assumptions made in respect of likely proximity to future proposed dwellings in assessment conclusions (paras 6.113 and 6.114 and 6.133 suggest these future receptors have been excluded from the assessment), and any specific mitigation relied upon.
- Clarify/justify why no Geographical Odour Modelling or provision of OEU levels caused in the worst-case scenario has been provided to support ES conclusions.

### Noise and Vibration (ES)

- Clarify why a +3dB façade reflection has not been applied in some cases (e.g. paras 14.76, 14.105, 14.152) but in others has (e.g. 14.135).
- Clarify the reduction in decibels assumed for boundary screening at para 14.97 (bunds and fencing).
- Clarify what consideration has been given noise impacts at times when roller shutter doors may be open (para 14.97).
- Clarify what corrections/penalties, if any, have been assumed for intermittency (para 14.103).
- Clarify/justify the use of a 65dB LAeq threshold for construction noise thresholds (para 14.134) particularly given the proposed construction hours and duration of the construction period.
- Clarify/justify why demolition and construction predicted noise levels does not include details or consideration of LMax levels (Tables 14.18 & 14.19).
- Clarify what is determined a 'short-term' impact in consideration of construction related impacts.
- Clarify what the 3dB addition relates to in table 14.20.

### Noise and Vibration (Appendix J)

- Page 15, paragraphs 2 and 5. Clarify if assumptions regarding dominance of Road Traffic noise were correct.
- Clarify consideration given to construction/demolition noise impacts upon neighbouring sports fields.
- Figures 4.1 – 4.4 show a period where data was not used due to Storm Ciara. Clarify why a precise 24-hour period was used instead of removing data based on the outliers (e.g. excessive wind speed etc.).

### **Arun District Council Drainage Engineer**

Arun District Council Drainage Engineer makes the following comments (and requests conditions). Clarification is requested as to whether such actions have been/would be undertaken, the extent to which they have been considered in the proposed drainage design, and/or whether it is proposed that this be considered at the detailed design stage (through planning conditions):

- The suitability for use of infiltration must be supported by on site testing. Groundwater levels are not so high as to preclude its use here.
- Discharge should be restricted to greenfield QBar where possible.
- Surface water must be contained safely within the site for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.
- If the existing outlet is to be used, then supporting evidence must be supplied to show that this is in an appropriate condition to receive this water.
- Further details on proposed treatment of surface water should be provided to evidence that downstream water bodies will not be negatively impacted by proposals.

### **Additional Information to be supplied (not requested under Regulation 25)**

In addition to the information detailed above, the County Council also requests that the following points are addressed;

- For all tables in Chapter 14 (Noise), it would be useful for the identified relevant threshold levels and to be included, including any variance thereto. This would allow for clear comparison with modelled noise levels. Further, where adverse effects are predicted, these would also benefit from clearly setting out the corresponding Adverse Effect Level as set out in the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE).
- Whilst the Plume Visibility Modelling Results (and discussion within Chapter 12 of the ES) are noted, consideration should be given to providing visualisations that include the plume in the worst-case scenario. It is recommended that these are provided for selection of viewpoints to be representative of near, mid, and distant views.
- Whilst some consideration appears to have been given to the potential traffic impacts upon amenity on the wider route of HGVs along Ford Lane/Church Lane (e.g. Planning Statement page 80), this does not appear to have considered the likely increase in HGV sizes when compared with the extant permission WSCC/096/13/F (a key likely change in comparison to the fall-back position). Accordingly, further assessment is recommended to address the potential impacts of HGVs on amenities and the character of this route, and potential for any change in, visual, noise, intimidation impacts (e.g. NMUs), or character impacts which may result.
- Provide an updated assessment of need and the sources of waste to be managed, taking into account the latest [West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan and Waste Local Plan: Monitoring Report 2019/20](#).
- Provide clarification the basis for the conclusion that the proposed development could be considered a 'low carbon technology' (in comparison to the use of conventional fossil fuels) and 'renewable energy source', including the extent to which this would be reliant on the feedstock (and biodegradable fractions thereof).
- Provide clarification as to whether Carbon Capture and Storage could be realistically 'retrofitted'.
- Provide clarification/justification as to the methodology adopted for comparison of carbon emissions of the proposed development compared with Landfill, in particular regarding consistency in consideration of biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of both.
- It is noted in ES Chapter 7 that the proposal has the potential to deliver increased carbon benefits and reduced GHG emissions through potential use of the CHP of inclusion of solar panels, however, no indication of the extent of such benefits/emissions is provided. Please clarify and provide estimates.

With reference to the full comments of the **WSCC Arboricultural Officer** (dated 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021) and **WSCC Landscape Architect** (dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021) you should consider/address the following:

- Clarify what, if any, opportunities for landscape screening, planting and biodiversity improvements beyond the site boundaries have been explored.

- The AIA suggests poplars along the access road have limited life remaining. Clarify how the LVIA has considered this and what, if any, opportunities have been considered to retain the screening effects of this landscape feature?
- Consider detailed comments regarding proposed tree stock, species and densities and management/maintenance provisions as raised by the WSCC Arboriculturist and Landscape Consultant.
- Provide details of proposed pond and measures to maximise biodiversity and ecological value
- Consider additional planting on some grey areas and around car parking areas.
- Clarify consideration given to the visual and landscape effect of the plumes (both day and night) and why visualisations have not shown this.
- Clarify the examination of the landscape baseline and how this has taken into key recreational, perceptual qualities and characteristics set out in LCAs including tranquillity, association, openness, topography, panoramic views, and long views to the South Downs.
- Clarify consideration given to the impact of the built form (including the stack and plume) where it breaks the horizon, including that of the South Downs or crosses the offing (the area of the sea seen below the horizon) in views from the north.

With reference to the full comments of the **ADC Environmental Health Officer** (dated 21<sup>st</sup> May 2021) you should consider/address the following:

- Consideration of additional air quality mitigation measures such as those listed below, particularly those focusing on reducing emissions from vehicles coming to and from and being used on the site itself:
  - Providing a public transport subsidy for employees;
  - Ensuring all new commercial vehicles comply with the latest European Emission Standards;
  - Implementing a fleet strategy that reduces emissions;
  - Using ultra-low emission service vehicles;
  - Investing in local walking and cycling initiatives;
  - Contributing to the cost of on-street EV recharging;
  - Contributing to unfunded measures identified in air quality action plans
  - Implementing a low emission strategy;
  - Contributing to local low or zero emission vehicle refuelling/recharging infrastructure;
  - Contributing to low emission bus service provision or waste collection services
  - Contributing to local bike/e-bike hire schemes; and
  - Funding incentives for the take-up of low emission technologies and fuel.

With reference to the comments of **Historic England** (dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021), and **WSCC Environment and Heritage** (dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021) you should consider/address the following:

- Additional Viewpoints and Visualisations from St Andrews Church Ford, including those used for the previous application (for comparison);
- Additional visualisations from within Yapton Conservation Area, particularly from the church;
- A Visualisation and Viewpoint from the field to the north east of Viewpoint 25 to represent the full extent of the Climping Deserved Medieval Settlement (northern area) Scheduled monument;



- Additional visualisations from Tortington Augustinian Priory; and
- Provision of an assessment of the impact on the Grade I, St Mary Church (Yapton) and the Yapton Conservation Area, to include consideration of views of the church and Conservation Area within the landscape setting.

With reference to the comments of **West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service** (dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021) you should consider/address the following:

- Please clarify the position of fire hydrants, and whether these would be replaced/retained.

In addition to the specific consultation responses referred to above (and selected matters identified), you are encouraged to review all consultation responses and third-party representations received in respect of the planning application (available on the WSCC website) and provide responses to the key issues raised.

Where the further information sought would require amended plans, please ensure that they are allocated a new 'revision' number and that any plans to be superseded are identified. It is also advised that the information should be presented in a single supplementary submission.

We would be grateful for your confirmation of the likely timescale necessary to allow you to respond to the above request for additional information. Please can you do so no later than 15<sup>th</sup> July 2021.

If you require any further clarification or if you wish to discuss the information requested, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely



James Neave  
Principal Planner  
County Planning