[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent: 19 August 2017 12:28
To: Cllr. Richard Bower
Subject: Planning Application: CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Sir,

Please find attached two documents setting out the reasons why I would urge the Development Control Committee NOT to grant planning permission for the above application.

Yours sincerely

Alan Brackley

29 Appletree Walk
Clymping
West Sussex
BN175QN
[redacted]

16/08/17

Councillor Ricky Bower
Arun District Council

Dear Sir,

Planning Application Number – CM/1/17/OUT
I write to you as Chairman of the Arun District Council Development Control Committe in connection with the planning application for the prime agricultural "Mulgrave Field" and would be grateful if you could advise on the following issues:
Why is Arun District Council choosing to ignore the democratically expressed views of residents in the ballot on the Local Plan, especially since we are frequently reminded by government ministers, including the Prime Minister, that the results of referenda should be binding? Does democracy only work at a national level?

It is clear from statements published by Arun's Planning Department in response to the application that supportive advice on how to proceed is being regularly offered. Why is advice not being offered to those who oppose the application?

Why is the application being considered at a Development Control Committee Meeting on August 24th.nearly a month before the review of the revised District Plan is to commence and in the middle of the summer holiday?

How does the "Calling-in" process work? I note from Clymping Parish Council that this has been requested but can find no acknowledgement of this from Arun.

How will you be supporting the overwhelming majority of voters who are totally opposed to this and any other large –scale development in the village? (Evidence both from the Clymping Local Plan vote and the attendance at the public meeting held by the Parish Council totally supports this view).

The evidence published by Arun's planners in response to this application suggests that they are doing everything they possibly can to ensure that it is approved and that the whole issue is a fait accompli.

Yours sincerely

Alan Brackley
Attached : Objections to the proposal

We wish to object in the strongest possible way to the proposal to build up to 300 homes on a green field space in Clymping.

Our reasons are as follows:

As notified on the Planning Application, the proposal is not in accordance with the Clymping Neighbourhood Plan, approved in a referendum by an overwhelming majority on December 3rd.2015 on a turnout in excess of 44%, one of the largest across Arun District. This plan was then adopted by Arun District Council on January 13th.2016. To quote senior government ministers, including the Prime Minister, "the result of the referendum was clear. It was legitimate". Whilst this may have referred to the national referendum, is there really any difference between "legitimate" national and local polls? After all, they were carried out in exactly the same way.
We note that in the equally overwhelming vote in Parliament in favour of accepting the result of the national referendum, all of our local M.P.s, including Nick Gibb, supported the motion. Clearly , they, together with colleagues including Gavin Barwell, Minister of State for Housing and Planning, believe that the results of referenda should be binding.

In 2015, Mulgrave Properties held a "consultation" with residents over a proposal to build 140 homes on the site. At that time, the Chairman Mr Adrian Christmas, gave villagers certain re-assurances which, we understand, addressed some of their concerns. He claimed that his company had "carefully considered the feedback we received from the 2015 consultation".

The current proposal , for up to 300 homes, completely ignores the original one and from the evidence of the extremely well-attended public meeting on January 31st, rides roughshod over the residents' views.

The Clymping Neighbourhood Plan accepted by Arun District Council describes Clymping as a parish with, according to the 2011 Census with a population of 771, with 348 dwellings. This proposal will virtually double that number and is totally contrary to the "Vision and Objectives"

outlined in the Clymping Neighbourhood Plan accepted by Arun District Council.

In his proposal, Mr Christmas claims that the proposal will provide "enhanced infrastructure for both the residents of the proposed development and existing residents of Clymping". (Littlehampton Gazette January 26th 2017.) We will now address these in as far as they are clear on the proposal:
Alterations to the road layout. Currently. Ford Road/Church Lane is extremely busy, with a blind junction for those turning right from Horsemere Green Lane. These proposals will do nothing to alleviate the problem as traffic will actually be coming at an even sharper angle from the new roundabout. In addition, vehicles wishing to turn either way out of the proposed development will be turning into traffic which is either not yet slowing down or accelerating. The proposed commercial development for Ford Airfield will further add to the number of heavy good vehicles using this road. In addition, this road is often used as an alternative route by traffic wishing to avoid the regular accidents and hold-ups at the Arundel and Crossbush junctions on the A27, with the result that at times it is impossible to exit from Horsemere Green Lane.

Horsemere Green Lane is already used as a "rat-run" by vehicles wishing to avoid travelling down to the A259, many of which totally ignore existing speed limits. The lane is narrow and hardly wide enough for two cars to pass, let alone the lorries which use it. The developers' proposal now includes an exit onto Horsemere Green Lane at a point alongside an existing property. This will be completely blind to traffic coming from the Church Lane end. The recent changes to the lay-out appear to have deterred some of the regular "rat-run" users although the reduced speed limit is meaningless unless it is properly enforced. This proposal will significantly increase the level of traffic and re-introduce the dangers which the work was intended to remove.

The A259 is both a very busy and a very noisy road, particularly since the opening of the Felpham by-pass, which has resulted in an increase in traffic which previously used the A27. The proposed development will add a minimum of four to five hundred cars in one small spot wishing to exit on to either Ford Road or the A259 to travel east or west. There are already considerable queues in both directions, with personal evidence clearly showing that these are developing far earlier in the morning and later in the afternoon/early evening than was the case before the by-pass opened. *

The far end of the proposed development is already an extremely dangerous junction, with several fatalities occurring in recent years. This can only become worse.*

*See comments on school provision

5. Education and school place provision.

We are retired headteachers with a combined total of more than thirty years management experience in West Sussex primary schools.

The proposals contain no provision for additional primary places but appear to be based on the assumption that the existing schools in the area can take the minimum of three hundred children which the development could be expected to produce. (Ons statistics – average 1.92 per household 2016)

In 2016, St Mary's CE Primary School had 103 children on roll, leaving a nominal two places. However, accessing this school would necessitate either attempting to walk across the A259m at peak times or adding to the traffic congestion by travelling by car. St Mary's is a Church Of England "situated in a rural village area" and as an aided school, "the admission of pupils is made by the governors in accordance with arrangements agreed with the Local Education Authority". Given the increasing volume of traffic using the A259, to which this proposal would only add, the prospect of young children attempting to cross this road is not a sensible one. Furthermore, any attempt put in a safe crossing would increase the existing traffic delays.

In 2016, there were places at Yapton Primary School, although given the amount of house building currently taking place in and around Yapton, these places may well be taken. Attendance at this school would be outside the two mile limit for children under eight and would therefore entitle them to free or subsidised transport. It would be asking too much for very young children to walk more than two miles along a very busy road, most of which has no footpath, so the only option will be to add to the already existing congestion outside the school. Furthermore, the most likely route for people taking their children to and from Yapton CE School will be to use Horsemere Green Lane, thereby further adding to the traffic problems along that road.

Children of secondary age would have to travel to Barnham, Littlehampton Academy or Felpham Academy and may well be entitled to transport. If not, they would need to be taken by car, further adding to the traffic using local roads.

The financial problems currently faced by West Sussex schools are well-documented and will certainly not place them in a position to cope with increased numbers. This proposal will only serve to add further problems to those already being faced by the schools.

The problems being faced by local medical practices are equally well-documented. Indeed, one surgery in Littlehampton has closed because of its inability to recruit staff. This proposal, which would bring at least another six hundred patients to the village, would greatly increase the pressure on already over-stretched practices and offers no alternative solutions.

The proposed site is a green field which, in addition to providing a much-needed agricultural resource, is a haven for a variety of wild life. Apart from the many species of birds which can regularly be found in the trees, hedgerows and on the ground, it is a home to wild deer which can often be seen in the field.

There are widespread local concerns about the existing drainage in the village, particularly along Horsemere Green Lane and Church Lane. The drains and ditches along the former frequently overflow and will become even worse with the increase in traffic which this development will bring. When we moved back to Clymping a couple of years ago we

were refused cover by our existing insurer because of the "flood risk". This was despite the fact that we had previously lived closer to the river on the eastern side of the Arun and had never experienced any difficulty in finding insurance. Even on the day of writing, the Environment Agency lists this postcode as an area where "flooding is possible". The long term flood risk information states that "This address is in or near a flood risk area", with a "medium risk" of flooding from surface water. (GOV.UK)

Mr Christmas (Mulgrave Properties) states that the development would provide "enhanced infrastructure" for the "existing residents of Clymping".

The village already has a church, a farm shop, Parish Centre, playing field with cricket and football pitches and two public houses with restaurants. The proposal offers nothing to the existing residents apart from an increase in traffic and the loss of quality agricultural land. There is very little scope for further employment in the village- consequently, anyone seeking work have to add to the existing congestion on already over-crowded roads.

In urging the Planning Committee to reject this application, which will double the size of the village and bring nothing of benefit to it, we trust that they will respect the Prime Minister's view that when the result of a referendum is "clear " and "legitimate", it should be binding.