Anna Aston-Clarke
17, May Close
Clymping
West Sussex
BN17 5TF

Your Ref: OWPC12612
Our Ref: CM/1/17/OUT *03-01-2017*
Please ask for:
Claire Potts

14th February 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town & country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Article 5

Outline application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings & ancillary development comprising open space, a building within use class D1 (Non- Residential Institutions) of up to 875 square metres net, a building for A1 (Shops) use having a floor area of up to 530 sq. metres net, together with open space & ancillary works, including car parking & drainage arrangements, with appearance, landscaping, layout & scale wholly reserved for subsequent approval. The access detail, showing the points of access to the development, & indicated on Bellamy Roberts drawings numbered 4724/004 & 4724/005 are access proposals to be determined at this stage of the application. For the avoidance of doubt all other access detail within the site is to be determined as a reserved matter at a later stage. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan & affects the setting of Listed Buildings.

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

---

Thank you for your internet representation made on 13th February 2017 which has been recorded as **'an objection'** with the comments as follows:

1. To build on irreplaceable Grade 1 & 2 farmland is criminal (or it should be!) and as the development is planned on a 'Greenfield' site, for this reason alone the development should not be permitted. If it is not overturned it will set a precedent for development into rural areas everywhere. ALL brownfield sites should be exhausted before building on any Greenfield site is permitted.

2. The Environment Agency's strategy for sea defence is for 'managed retreat'. The existing Agricultural land to the south of the A259 will be partially lost. Agricultural land is required to feed the growing population. The landowner is very short sighted in this regard. It is likely that in 100 years, farmland will be worth WAY more than building land. As Mark Twain said, "Buy land, they're not making it anymore".

3. Removing the trees on the south side of the site to facilitate moving a roundabout will see that road noise (and pollution) experienced by nearby homes is significantly increased - including those on the development. Who will buy these?

4. The proposed homes are to be built 300mm higher than the ground. If there is a risk of flooding, they should not be built 300mm higher, they should not be built at all! The risk of increased flooding in the area is very real, and the developer hasn't even carried out a percolation test. Clearly there is a flood risk or the developer would not bother to raise the heights of the homes!

5. The Environment Agency flood risk reports would not record flooding in the field because it is not a watercourse. Surface water flooding does occur and does affect homes in the surrounding area.

6. The developer calculated the foul sewerage outlet required for 140 homes and the sewerage system currently in place proved to be insufficient for that number of dwellings. Now the developer has stated that it is not 'viable' to build the development with less than 300 homes, yet no clear solution for the foul sewerage has been identified.

7. This proposed development is contrary to the Clymping Neighbourhood Plan and is also therefore, contrary to item 198 of the NPPF.

8. The 'traffic model' created by the developer to predict traffic flow appears to have been unable to accurately calculate the traffic flow to the extent that Highways England does not feel that the traffic flow information provided allows an informed decision to be made.

9. The proposed development shows homes on its northern boundary with north facing gardens backing on to existing dwellings. Residents were informed this was to 'integrate' the new homes with the existing south facing homes despite there being no access to the rest of the village (except via the gardens of the existing dwellings). This proves Mulgrave's lack of understanding of the site and the village.

10. Mulgrave claims to have 'engaged' with the village residents regarding this development that will more than double the village in size. The sum total of their 'engagement' was an afternoon presentation in the middle of the summer holidays in 2015 and an appearance at a village meeting in February 2017 in the Church Hall with only 24 hours notice. Once again, proving that unlike Lord Moyne, the interests of the village are not their focus.

11. The 'bullying tactics' that Mulgrave has displayed have left a particularly nasty taste in local resident's mouths. In not so many words, Mulgrave intonated that if the development of 80 - 140 homes did not go ahead, the land would be sold to the likes of Persimmon (or similar high density developers) and the entire area would be covered in dwellings (despite the site being unsuitable), proving yet again that Mulgrave (despite what they say) are not in this to 'help give a heart to the village'. This development will simply be an insular and inaccessible 'enclave' created for the profit of the landowner with little or no thought for what happens afterwards.

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Director Planning & Economic Regeneration