

Comment for planning application WSCC/011/21

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/011/21"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Peter Newman"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="CHURCH FARM HOUSE, CHURCH ROAD, CHURCH ROAD, ARUNDEL, BN18 0EP"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>Having considered the further information provided, my concerns have still not been answered and I remain opposed to this proposal on grounds its size and massing for its location is far too large. The site is a rural coastal plain with no tall other building in proximity and would stand like a blot on the landscape and be visible for miles.</p> <p>The proposed buildings would visually impact negatively on the immediate and extended area including several Grade 1 listed buildings. The site sit's close to the boundary of the South Downs National Park and the proposal's impact would be highly detrimental in terms of its overbearing visibility, the night time light pollution, emissions of smell and the regular plumes of gases emanating from its two huge chimneys.</p> <p>This application is in clear conflict with S.11 of the West Sussex local waste policy document 2014 . A similar application for an incinerator building of almost identical height and mass in Ely, Cambridgeshire has recently seen the planning inspector's decision to refuse consent, due to the sites close proximity to a Grade 1 monument, upheld by the Secretary of State (App ref S/3372/17/CW) dated 15th June 2020. By comparison the Ford site is far more sensitive than the Ely location due to its lack of natural screening, closeness of several national monuments (including Arundel Castle) and a National Park.</p> <p>If consented this proposal would potentially sterilize the adjacent site to the south and west which has an allocation for 1,500 homes immediately to the west/south of the site housing - who would want to live and raise a family in the shadow of an incinerator?</p> <p>The application documents present highly questionable visuals of the proposals - it has taken a creative eye to effectively mask such a structure from the various view points. It is disappointing that despite further requests, the applicant has chosen not to provide the necessary visual information required. I also wonder how a so called expert in terms of assessing the schemes visual impact can realistically claim that the proposals would have an insignificant or negligent affect. I appreciate such views have some subjectivity, but they must lose credibility when they fail to acknowledge the effect of the sheer scale and mass of the proposed building.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact on the Yapton conservation area which includes the grade 1 listed St Mary's church is woefully misleading. The photo has been taken from the road in front of the church, (which blocks any view of the subject site) whereas the views from within the church yard which extend along the side and around the church have not been considered. I would therefore ask the members not to be hoodwinked by what is to all intents and purpose a "marketing" brochure for the scheme.</p> <p>The need argument for such a facility is also questionable given the ETW proposed at Horsham which was granted planning consent in February 2020.</p> <p>Please refuse this application.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="25/08/2021 14:53:16"/>
Attachments	