

David Miranda
20 The Hamlet
Waterford Gardens
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN175RY

Your Ref: OWPC26368
Our Ref: F/4/20/OUT 25-02-2020
Please ask for:
Raymond Cole

15th April 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Town & country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Article 5

Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the development of up to 1,500 dwellings (Use Class C3), 60-bed care home (Use Class C2), up to 9,000 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Classes B1), local centre of up to 2,350 sqm including up to 900 sqm retail / commercial (Use Classes A1-A5) and 1,450 sqm community / leisure floorspace (Use Classes D1-D2), land for a two-form entry primary school (Use Class D1), public open space, allotments, new sports pitches and associated facilities, drainage, parking and associated access, infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, including demolition of existing buildings and part removal of existing runway hardstanding. This application affects a Public Right of Way. This application is the subject of an Environmental Statement. This application may affect the setting of a Listed Building. This application falls within CIL Zone 1 - Zero Rated.

Land at Ford Airfield Ford

Thank you for your internet representation made on 14th April 2020 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

I object to the application and endorse Clymping Parish Council's objections summarised as:- "It's Contrary to basic principles of Clymping NP and objective to retain Clymping as separate village set in countryside as defined in ADC LPP C SP1 Countryside. Proposed site layout will lead effectively to coalescence of Ford -Clymping contrary to principles defined in section 7.4.2. of Arun's Local Plan seeking to maintain separate identity and amenities of existing settlements. It is contrary to Clymping Neighbourhood Plan Policy CPN14 re Traffic and the Environment. Transport Assessment fails to assess traffic impact in Clymping adequately providing no proportionate mitigation [1] Suggesting 356 vehicles would leave a 1500 homes development in morning peak is not credible.[2]. Claims Yapton and Ford level crossings are adequate with spare capacity don't match resident's experience. Bulk of development traffic will move south via Clymping. Holdups at crossing extensive at peak, queues don't routinely disperse as gates open [3] Transport Assessment for Secondary School recognises material local traffic increase but assumes majority of extra traffic enters from north via Ford Lane. School likely to attract students from Middleton, Felpham and Littlehampton together with Ford and Clymping accessing school from the south via Clymping. [4] We believe impact at dangerous Oystercatcher Junction (Yapton Road/A259) will be severe. Assessment accepts Oystercatcher junction will go overcapacity but applicant offers no mitigation proposals except undefined contribution to future undefined improvement. Development shouldn't start until improvements complete or lives may be lost. [5] Proposed layout precludes future possible route via A259 west of Oystercatcher via airfield, bridging railway and linking to A27 bypassing Clymping, Ford, Yapton and Middleton providing northerly future route for extra traffic from housing / industrial developments. Object to application failing to keep this future option open. [6] Traffic impact on HGL will be severe. It's a notorious 'rat run' to avoid Oystercatcher Junction to access A259 via Church Lane roundabout. Traffic will significantly increase if

application implemented which Transport Assessment ignores. Modelling has no traffic numbers for HGL or at junctions with Yapton Road/ Church Lane.[7] Traffic impact on HGL fully at odds with applicants' proposed sustainable transport route into/ along HGL in direction of Littlehampton, to current cycle route on A259, to open countryside of Littlehampton - Middleton on Sea Gap , Clymping beach. Need for such route should be considered with proposals for strategic development in Clymping approved under CM/1/17/OUT, currently includes road link from HGL into development, through and out into Church Lane. Together, the strategic housing proposals will lead to dangerous mix of rat run traffic, pedestrians/ cyclists in number of places along common road space given lack of footpaths/ cycleways.[8]Application needs consideration in with F/5/20/PL where Transport assessment shows increases measured in hundreds of vehicles accessing Ford Mkt from West along HGL. It's clear there's pressing need for thorough reconsideration of expected usage, design and facilities for different users and road junctions along HGL-junction with Church Lane before proceeding with this housing development. [9] Recognising proposals to improve pavement on Church Lane but are on eastern side. Pedestrians / cyclists will have to cross Church Lane with increased traffic as result of F/4/20/OUT, F/5/20/PL and proposed industrial developments on Ford Airfield including Viridor Grondon Incinerator. No controlled crossing point is proposed".

Unfortunately it is not possible for the council to respond to each representation individually but your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

If the application is to be determined at the Development Control Committee and your letter has been received after the agenda has been published, you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and the procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances, it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the website or telephone for further information. Please be advised that any comments received after the the Development Control Agenda has been produced will be reported to the meeting. Please also note that only a small number of all planning applications are determined at the Development Control Committee, most are determined by officers under delegated power.

All representations are published on our website so please make sure your views are clear and only include information that you are happy for the public to view. Do not include personal information or information from third parties unless you have their permission to do so. If a complaint is received that permission has not been given for comments included about a third party, the Council reserves the right to redact/remove all relevant information. Do not include information that is defamatory or breaches equality or other legislation. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the website and on the file, please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed, although this does mean that its contents will be disregarded. For details of what we do with your personal information please refer to our privacy statement comments on planning applications which is available on our website www.arun.gov.uk/planning-privacy-statements.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning