

Observation and comments on amended application CM/48/21/RES
Tim Hibbert 20 May Close Climping BN17 5TF

As a resident of Climping I wish to formally object to the amended application on the following grounds:

Application status

1. An application for a material change of use is distinctly separate to an application for outline planning permission and subsequent reserved matters. These are separate types of planning consent and subject to different regimes with different fee structures. Being mutually exclusive this illustrates that an outline application cannot be used to consider or determine a proposal for a material change of use.
2. I have been advised that the Local Planning Authority and applicant have agreed to make changes under the current live application. This would seem to be in conflict with planning protocols, and I assume the Council have taken full legal advice on this matter.
3. If Planning Committee can approve or refuse the application on the basis of the revised information and its compliance to the relevant Development Plan policies, this would suggest that this in reality is a new application.

Transport issues

1. The transport proposals are disappointing and focus on the need to demonstrate compliance with various policy documents rather than mitigate the potential harm to the existing Climping community. Although the latest developer proposals have limited the access to the site from Horsemere Green Lane to pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles, as a regular user of this lane, the only way forward is to have no entrance /exit from Horsemere Green Lane.
2. The Oyster junction is critical. Safeguarding land for future works for a 15year period is inadequate in view of potential major developments in Yapton, Ford and beyond. In addition, no account appears to have been in relation to the impact of Highways England A27 proposals on the A259. I can see no

evidence of traffic flow measurements along Church Lane, Horsemere Green Lane, the A259 and Yapton Road. I would have expected to see cumulative predictions of traffic growth along these routes for a 15year period. (It is claimed that WSCC have made a bid for funding for the Oyster junction works, which will be supported by Developer contributions, no definitive decision appears to have been made.)

3. The travel plan misses the point. Giving incoming residents a leaflet seems to fall far short of what is required. The council have robust policies in place to reduce the number of people travelling by car. The aim should be to increase the number of people using active and sustainable travel modes. This should include residents, employees, visitors, customers, deliveries, contractors or business vehicles.
4. Critical for the success of the travel plan are providing measures to support its delivery. These include marketing materials, promotional events and monthly surgery sessions for residents. I am assuming Arun Council have legal responsibility for the delivery of the travel plan.

Affordable homes

1. The Affordable Home units are included to enable the developer to meet the Councils affordable homes requirement. The site overall will have a mixture of occupancy types, not all of whom will necessarily have a car for travel purposes. How are this group going to get to and from work, or children to school? The timetable of the existing bus providers will not help.
2. My suggested solution will be to provide a community bus service, not only for those without a car, but for the occupiers of the estate as a whole, funded by S106 monies for a 3 year period. This bus service could also act as a vital travel link and used by the wider existing Climping community. The service could be expanded to service the other new developments in the area. (the Department of Transport have provided support for community transport services in the past, which could be run by volunteers)

Community Buildings

1. The Planning statement seems to be suggesting that the community buildings will enable the developer to meet the social and economic requirements of NPFF. These buildings are not going to provide jobs for residents/tenants on site, jobs are going to be away from the site.
2. There already exists local community facilities which could meet the demand for social interaction.
3. What has changed as a result of Covid is the move to hybrid working, mixing home and office. Although this has led to increased productivity, can this be sustained in the medium to long term.
4. Foreman Homes in Climping Village news asked for a comment about the use of these buildings. I would like to put forward the proposal to use these so called community buildings as a local economic hub with full fibre broadband, perhaps leased by the Councils broad band provider and creating an opportunity for social interaction for home workers.