

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL – PLANNING SERVICES

Environment & Heritage Team – Response to consultation by County Planning

Built Heritage comments

To: - planning.applications@westsussex.gov.uk

FAO: - Andrew Sierakowski, County Planning

DATE: 2nd September 2021

REF.: WSCC/011/21

LOCATION: Ford Circular Technology Park, Ford Road, 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

An objection is raised to the development on heritage grounds, due to the impact on the settings of heritage assets, including Grade II Listed Buildings to the south of Ford Lane, in particular the Grade II Listed, Atherington House. Further afield the negative impact of the scheme would harm the significance of the Grade I Listed St Andrew's Church, Grade I Listed Arundel Castle (also a Grade II* Registered Park/Garden), the Grade I Listed Church of St Nicholas, the Grade I Listed Arundel Cathedral and the Arundel Conservation Area. The scheme has potential to result in further harm to the Yapton Conservation Area and the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary. The result would be varying degrees of less than substantial level of harm to the significance of these heritage assets.

Policies: National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 192, 193, 194, 196 and 200; Adopted Arun Local Plan 2018, Policy HER DM1 (Listed Buildings) (e).

COMMENTS:

The following comments address the built heritage considerations.

Place Services Historic Building advisor to West Sussex has reviewed the documents submitted which are the original documents that were responded to in June.

On the planning portal, the applicant's letter - *Further Info - Reg25 - Part 1- Letter - July 21.pdf (kb)* rebuts previous comments made and justifies why they won't be submitting any additional information.

However, we consider that they still have not addressed the matters raised and consider that the previous response (dated June 2021) and assessment of impact is still relevant.