Susan M. Olford
16 Cropthorne Drive
Clymping
West Sussex BN17 5GG
[redacted]

RECEIVED
15 FEB 2017

Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton

15th February 2017

Sirs

Planning Application CM/1/17/OUT

Points for consideration on the above.

1. The Application is outside the village's Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and therefore does not seek to follow the wishes of the Voting members of the Community who supported the NP; the Scheme specifically designed by Government to see residents take a part in their Neighbourhoods.
2. The 300 quoted property numbers (c. 600 residents) will double the size of the existing village - with its Rural and Coastal characteristics – new Application does not fit with our NP.
3. The current primary School does not have the capacity to take potentially another 300+ children. Expansion of the school on its current site would use more high grade agricultural land. Where do the new children find a school?
4. Medical facilities currently are in Yapton, Middleton or Littlehampton. All require vehicles to reach them. Littlehampton surgeries are closing. Yapton/Middleton have closed books – they are fully subscribed. Building a Surgery premises by the Developers is a nice idea but it doesn't provide GPs to run it. It must not be forgotten that GP Surgeries are effectively private businesses with GPs having to fund the purchase of the premises' often meaning they have home and business mortgages to fund. The Yapton/Middleton surgery has struggled for over 10 years to recruit more full time GPs, where do a further 600+ people find a medic?
5. I see no particular emphasis on Sheltered Accommodation for over 55/60s.
6. With item 5 in mind, the Site Plan shows no specific provision for Local Housing needs. Indeed Clymping village, as it is, could never 'need' 300 additional houses.
7. Much is talked of flooding. The Plans take note of 100 & 200 year events of the River Arun flooding. It takes no account of current flooding on the Mulgrave field. Recent flooding came off that parcel of land. and flooded another's residence, Field Place. Field water flows into the some ditches – if kept cleared – and then into the Arun. Other places like the Mulgrave field have no ditches.
8. Access roads to the site: one access is to Horsemere Green Lane (HGL). This will further the issues of a dangerous exit from the eastern end of HGL, and at The Oystercatcher. The Plan makes no mention of solving these known dangerous junctions. It just puts more vehicles onto those junctions.
9. The southerly access road – as drawn on Plan – opens to Church Lane. Developers will improve the current roundabout on the A259. It is needed due to the current heavy traffic level. HGV traffic increases all the time due to industrial usage from the large Ford sites, and 5 sites in Clymping itself (A259, 2 in Yapton Road, Church Lane, and Crookthorne Lane) all visited by HGVs. Grundon are coming to Ford. Church Lane has many exit roads on it. HGL is already a dangerous exit. The proposed new estate will be another.
10. The Felpham by-pass has helped their residents. That by-pass has made life dangerous and difficult for residents of Middleton (exit at comet Cottage, waiting time often 20 mins at

peak periods). That by-pass has cut the Rural and Coastal village of Clymping in TWO. Our School, one pub, farm shop, beach and local hotel/spa are to the South, our church and majority of housing to the north of the A259. No provision has been made by WSCC or ADC to assist safe passage across the A259, this development adds more residents & vehicles and still provides no safe passage, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.

11. It is wrong to look at this site in isolation. Proposals for our area are up to a further 4500 houses (Ford, LEGA, Yapton and Climping further sites). Slightly further afield (Barnham, Eastergate, Walberton, Fontwell and West Bersted) are planned up to 5400 houses. Just take the idea of a further 2000 houses at West Bersted. Many will access straight on to the A259 and drive east to cut Climping in half. Climping is getting the blight of increased traffic. If Ford gets 1500 to 2000 houses; Climping gets the blight of the inceased traffic. Indeed, the majority of people travelling west (from LEGA) or the remainder travelling east will drive through Climping. Please calculate how many additional vehicles will drive through our village with near 10,000 additional houses.
12. Please consider how we are trapped in this area of Coastal West Sussex.
    We are trapped by the Sea to the South and to some extent the A259. No one can travel very far south of the A259 and certainly not beyond the Sea.
    We are trapped to some extent on the northern edge by the A27. The well known issue of an accident on A259/A27 in the Littlehampton/Arundel area are documented. The resultant traffic stuck on one road or the other comes through – yes, Climping. A further blight for us.
    We are trapped in between these two roads by a railway line. It has crossing points at Wick, Ford, Yapton and Westergate. Wick is the chosen route for HGV's – poor residents of Wick who get much of the traffic which has just come from Climping. Ford crossing is notorious for being closed for 5 trains. Yapton crossing is OK but will begin to take more and more HGV's from Ford Road/Ford Lane Ind. Estates. Westergate on the A29 I know little about. But the A29 is our western 'Trap' line. The eastern 'Trap' line is the River Arun, single lane road over the River.
    Non-coastal towns and villages have 4 points of the compass for access and exit; Climping has only 3 directions, and one of those is often barred by a railway, river or trunk road.
13. As a resident of Cropthorne Drive, I must register my objection to the Footpath marked on the map of the Site which leads over private land into Cropthorne Drive. It further suggests that the footpath leads to a children's play area and small green. That parcel of land is private property, owned by Spindrift Court (Climping) Management Co. Ltd and the shareholders are the owners at Cropthorne Drive. We pay to maintain the playground/green, to a high standard, and insure it for residents use. All those costs are borne by us. It is not a public area.

In essence, what is planning trying to do to this tiny, rural, coastal village with listed buildings and church? Aesthetic, irreputable changes are in planning, and many dangerous ones for road safety, property, and environment. With 13 objective points raised above, there is no option for me but to oppose this Planning Application. I might add that I have lived here (or within a 2 mile radius of my current home) for 44 years so I think I know the area well.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Susan M Olford

cc: Mr Nick Gibb, MP