

From : Mrs Kaisa Miranda
20 The Hamlet
Waterford Gardens
Clymping
Littlehampton
BN17 5RY

To : Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF.

04.06.2018

To Whom It May Concern Regarding

Proposal Outline application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings & ancillary development etc

Location Land West of Church Lane & South of Horsemere Green Lane
Climping

I wish to object to the above application Reference CM/13/18/OUT for the following reasons: -

1. The application is contrary to our made, adopted and ratified Neighbourhood Plan, as noted by the Clymping Parish Council in their list of material objections, and so contrary to item 198 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).
2. No current economic reason has been demonstrated for a development of this scale. Nor are there local employment opportunities of the scale required to support such a development.
3. The local road network is already over-loaded without even considering the addition of 450+ vehicles that would be attributable to the residents of the proposed development . The *capacity* of the network cannot be addressed or improved simply by the construction of a new larger roundabout . This would only address traffic *flow*. Church Lane has only one lane in each direction, with traffic build ups at the intersection with the A259 enhanced by 'convoys' of traffic that build up waiting for Ford level crossing to open . This proposal does nothing to promote sustainable transport as required by item 34 of the NPPF.

4. There is no up to date and adopted local plan in place, therefore there should not be a presumption in favour of this proposal.
5. This proposal is an over-development of the village given it would almost double its size. Presently there are 323 households in Clymping to which this application proposes the addition of a further 300. When considered with other proposed developments on the West Bank and other housing allocations in adjoining parishes (e.g. Ford: 1500 homes) Clymping and other villages, as settlements, would coalesce, forming an extended dormitory suburb of Littlehampton.
6. The site is 'Grade 1 and 2' prime agricultural land (currently under cultivation). The land is farmed by an independent local family so there is a potential of employment cutbacks and reduction of income. Farming is at the heart of this rural setting. 87 % of respondents surveyed in the preparation of the Neighbourhood plan agreed 'the Rural Character is the most important feature of Clymping' (p13 14.15 The Natural Environment)
7. Arun District Council's own HELAA assessment summary table of November 2016, page 260, notes that this site can be deemed a deliverable strategic site (purely because the developer has offered it). It also notes under the title Suitability Summary that, *the site is distant from any main settlements and would set a precedent for development into open countryside. The area is judged as having a negligible/low landscape capacity for development. The site is therefore considered not suitable for development.*
8. From the emerging local plan, this development would be contrary to the following clauses:
 - a. Clause 4.18 of page 33
 - b. Page 36 and 37 – Clymping is shown as outside of the urban development area
 - c. Clause 7.1.2 of page 43
 - d. Clause 7.1.5 of page 43
 - e. Page 46 policy SD SP2
 - f. In support of the previous clause, Page 137 clause 12.1.24,
 - g. Page 162 clause 12.4.5 and policy H SP3, - there is no identified need within the village. Just because ADC cannot demonstrate a housing supply for the next 5 years, does not on a local basis make this development 'needs led'.
 - h. Page 185 policy D DM1 1 and 3

9. Highways England, have yet to conclude discussions for changes to the A27 and in particular how this may impact on the settlements south of Arundel. I feel that until there is more certainty on this matter that localised alterations that the applicant may suggest cannot be well balanced in terms of future sustainability.
10. I am concerned for unknown negative health effects of higher levels of pollution that increased road traffic and the repositioning of the A259 roundabout closer towards existing developments to the south side of Horsemere Green Lane will create.
11. There are insufficient local school places to cater to the number of children the development will bring to the area.
12. There is insufficient capacity in local NHS surgeries to cater to the number of adults and children the development will bring to the area.
13. The water table on the site is particularly high and no current percolation test data has been available to members of the public furthermore this winter's rainfall has been relatively low so any results are likely to be skewed in favour of the applicant. Flooding is a known problem on the site such that seabirds and swans use the seasonal lakes that form on the site. The applicant has failed to provide adequate sewage and drainage information to allow a safe determination of the application other than of refusal.
14. 14.The wildlife on the site and its margins is reported elsewhere, but should include a group of up to four deer that often seen out on the field itself.




Taken 09.02 2017 from The Hamlet viewing south towards A259. Original available upon request.

15. The applicant staged a consultation for the community where they presented an option for circa 80 to 140 homes on Monday 27th July 2015 at Bailiffscourt Hotel . That date being

the UK outflow peak of the summer holiday season ; some have said a date that minimised potential attendance . Local news and records establish the scale of that original scheme was widely unaccepted once known to local residents through other means, causing as it did upset and protests . In the knowledge that Clymping's made Neighbourhood Plan accepts the principal of development based on local 'need only '.....' 'for small scale housing developments' the applicant originally reverted in late 2016 with the even more controversial application for 300 homes which was refused in 2017. This latest application is no less contentious and unsuitable than that which was refused.

I politely request that Councillors reconsider their thinking as well as the views of Climping Parishioners as expressed through their Parish Council and reject this latest application.

Yours Sincerely



Kaisa Miranda