[redacted]

From: David Miranda[redacted]
Sent: 22 August 2017 21:34
To: Cllr. Jacky Pendleton; Cllr. Richard Bower; Cllr. Elaine Stainton; Cllr. Jim Brooks; 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.phillipa.bower[redacted] Cllr. Paul Wells; Cllr. Ian Buckland
Subject: Please say 'No' to CM/1/17/OUT Site: Land West of Church Lane &, South of Horsemere Green Lane, Climping

Dear Councillor

Re : Development Control Committee will meeting 24.08.17 to determine planning application number: CM/1/17/OUT Site: Land West of Church Lane &, South of Horsemere Green Lane, Climping

My name is David Miranda and I live in Waterford Gardens off Horsemere Green Lane.
I am also Co-Chairman of the Clymping Field Protection Group (CFPG) whose over 130 supporters are in opposition to this application.

You will already hear from the Clymping Parish Council and from Alan Lovell.
The points they will make are fully supported and endorsed by myself for the group I represent.

Let us be absolutely clear - this matter is not about Nimbyism.

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

I am confident that you will fully read the officer's report and all of the representations made to the council. No Councillor could fail to note the vast majority of which are strongly opposed to this specific development. It is unacceptable in its size, bulk and mass and is clearly an over-development of our small village whilst being dis-proportionate and un-sympathetic to the wider community.

In late 2015 my Co-Chairman (of CFPG) and I attended as observers at a meeting held by our MP Nick Gibb. He was joined by Mulgrave's Chairman Adrian Christmas and a representative f*rom* their PR agency. Mr Christmas made it abundantly clear that Mulgrave's express intent was to develop the field and divest themselves of their interest in it, in its entirety - even if it takes us a 100 years to do it". Having noted the volume of negative representations we reported to him he encouragingly said he'd "engage, engage and engage with the community." The application **CM/1/17/OUT** more than doubles the number of houses originally proposed. We find it impossible to understand how this application represents the outcome of 'engagement'. Indeed, can you?

To a point, I have some sympathy with your position as does my co-chairman, a former Epsom and Ewell Borough Councillor and planning committee member whose sat on many planning applications. We see here one that seeks to ignore local concerns and a Neighbourhood plan by exploiting an as yet un-adopted Local Plan. If this application is granted I can see no point in all the earnest time and effort the Parish Council and its parishioners have been put to in coming to a point of agreement on and voting for our Neighbourhood Plan.

The site was previously found unsustainable and unsuitable for development. Like most others opposed to the application I cannot fathom how this site can be considered sustainable when there have been no infrastructure improvements of any material consequence since it was previously assessed. To now say it is sustainable can only be as a result of changing the criteria to get to achieve that decision.

I must underline my support In respect of a point Alan Lovell has made in writing and will repeat make when he speaks at Thursday's hearing:
"This proposal is for some 300 homes which makes it ¾ of the size of ALL of the current Climping Village. Because of this scale it must be considered as Strategic and dealt with through the Local Plan process. As the Public Inquiry for this is only a few weeks away, that must be the sensible course to take. " Clymping Parish Council share the same view.

However, this matter is clearly politicised due to ADC's lack of a 5-year housing supply. We see that Mulgrave's application and the size of it has been invited by Arun District Council in an effort to partially relieve its long-term housing supply shortage. So, in a headlong drive for housing and with the potential of 1500 houses to our north on Ford - coupled to well over one thousand houses on the West bank Clymping could simply be squeezed and coalesced out of existence if you let it. I urge you not to allow this to happen by saying 'NO' to this application

Yours sincerely

David Miranda

20 The Hamlet
Waterford Gardens
Clymping
Littelhampton
BN17 5RY