[redacted]

From: Dave Mayall[redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2017 15:34
To: Cllr. Jacky Pendleton; Cllr. Richard Bower; Cllr. Elaine Stainton; Cllr. Jim Brooks; Cllr. Jacqui Maconachie; Cllr. John Charles; Cllr. Pat Dillon; Cllr. Dougal Maconachie; Cllr. Dawn Hall; Cllr. Alan Gammon; Cllr. Phil Hitchins; Cllr. Vicky Rhodes; Cllr. Barbara Oakley; Cllr. Colin Oliver-Redgate; Cllr. Paul Wells; Cllr. Stephen Haymes; Cllr. Paul Wotherspoon; Cllr. Derek Ambler
Subject: Planning Application CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Councillors

Firstly may I state that I write on my behalf only. The views expressed here are mine personally, they are not representative of the wider community, or any pressure group, and are not coerced in any way.

I write with regard to the above outline planning application submitted by the Mulgrave LLP, and I wish to raise my concerns and objections to it.

By the time you read this and the attached, I will have submitted my formal concerns and opposition to this application online in the correct manner. Unfortunately, the online form only permits 4000 characters which wasn't sufficient for what I required.

I have submitted nonetheless a short-form bullet point list of what I consider to be material reasons for a refusal of this application online, and I have attached the long form version for your review and consideration. These are the areas I believe you should consider when determining this application, and I believe are the relevant areas from Our neighbourhood plan, the emerging local plan and the NPPF. Please take the time to review my points and to consider them fully in relation to this application, be they actual policy points or simple narratives from the policy documents.

Let me be absolutely clear on this matter, this is not about Nimbyism.

I, like many consulted upon and those that responded to our now adopted and ratified neighbourhood plan, agreed that a small housing development on the scale recently seen in Horsemere Green Lane would be acceptable. I am sympathetic to some development, as long as it is proportionate.

What is not acceptable is a development of this size, bulk and mass, that is clearly an over-development of the village, dis-proportionate and un-sympathetic to the wider community.

To propose a development that will nearly double the size of the dwellings and population of this village cannot be right.

To a point I have some sympathy with your position. As a former Borough Councillor and planning committee member, I have sat on many planning applications that sought to ride rough shot over local concerns and plans, that sought to over-develop, and that seek to exploit a lame local plan and administration.

However, this application is clearly politicized due to ADC's lack of a 5-year housing supply. I understand that this application and the size of it, is not being promoted by Mulgrave LLP, but being invited by ADC in an effort to partially dig them (ADC) out of their long term housing supply shortage hole.

At a meeting in late 2015 that I attended with Mulgrave's Chairman Adrian Christmas, a representative from SP Broadway, and our MP Nick Gibb, Adrian Christmas made it abundantly clear that Mulgrave's express intent was to diversify their interest in that field in its entirety.

This is not about Mulgrave LLP desire to put a heart into the village, this is about exploitation of the current impasse of the local plan and them maximising their profit margins. So please do not be fooled by this obsequious developer.

The Mulgrave Estate and the Moyne families long term, historic and contributory association with and to the village, is neither here nor there now. They no longer have any interest in Clymping period, do not be swayed by any suggestion to the contrary.

This is an unsafe allocation and on a site not suitable for a large scale development as being sought and promoted here, a point noted in your own HELAA document of November 2016, page 260 refers.

There are many other issue surrounding this application which I have listed in attached, primarily, that raised by the Highways Agency who have sought a deferment, or, have indicated a refusal currently would be appropriate.

I urge you to put aside the political need for this application, and to seriously consider the wider effects that a development of this size, mass and bulk would have on a village like Clymping and the wider communities surrounding Clymping.

This application has much wider and heavier implications for Arun if it is permitted, this will set a precedent for development in open countryside, a countryside that you are charged as our elected representatives with protecting.

It will be open season for developers from there on in. Please consider carefully, I am sure you do not want to see or be responsible for the ultimate loss of such communities like Clymping, but that is what will happen here and in the longer term.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for taking the time to read the above and hopefully the attached, and in advance, for your informed and considered views going forward.

Kind Regards

Dave Mayall
Senior Partner

M&M TECHNICAL SERVICES

[redacted]
20 Appletree Walk, Clymping, Arundel, West Sussex, BN17 5QN

Our Core Values: Focusing on our customers; Valuing diversity and equality; Improving continuously; Providing Value for money; Performing with integrity, openness and honesty



Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary - SAVE PAPER

This email [and any attachments] is intended solely for the individual[s] to whom addressed. It may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. Any statement or opinions therein are not necessarily those of M & M Technical Services unless specifically stated. Any unauthorised use, disclosure or copying is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Security and reliability of the e-mail and attachments are not guaranteed. You must take full responsibility for virus checking.