

Chichester District Council

Development Plan Panel

Thursday 13 February 2014

**General Comments and Actions Required on the Chichester Local Plan:
Key Policies Pre-submission 2014-2029**

1. Contact

Mike Allgrove - Planning Policy Manager
Telephone: 01243 521044
E-mail: mallgrove@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 **That the Development Plan Panel recommends to the Cabinet to note the main issues arising from the representation period on the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-Submission 2014-2029.**

3. Background

- 3.1. The Regulation 19 pre-submission public representation period ran from 8 November 2013 to 6 January 2014 and attracted 469 comments from 119 respondents. All comments are public and can be seen on the consultation portal at www.chichester-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal.
- 3.2. A summary of the main issues arising are attached as appendix 2. The summaries have been separated according to Chapter and Policy areas as they appear in the *Local Plan*.

4. Strategic sites

- 4.1. Below are brief overviews of the representations received on the strategic sites. A full summary of the comments received on each of the sites is available in appendix 2.

West of Chichester

Broad support for this Strategic Development Location (SDL) was given by the Environment Agency, English Heritage, West Sussex County Council and the site promoters, Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd. Concerns regarding West of Chichester were broadly based on the following topics:

- Impact on biodiversity/sustainability/environment (Chichester Harbour SPA)
- Number of new dwellings
- Infrastructure requirements (transport, wastewater)
- Access to the southern part of the site

Westhampnett/North East Chichester

Support for this policy was received from the site promoters (Commercial Estates Group), although they argue that the site could accommodate 1,100 dwellings. Objectors to this strategic site include Westhampnett Parish Council, Goodwood Estate, South Downs Society, The Chichester Society and Rolls-Royce. The concerns regarding this site were broadly based on the following topics:

- Coalescence of settlements
- Flooding
- Landscape & heritage
- Green Infrastructure
- Noise
- Infrastructure

Tangmere

Broad support was received from English Heritage for this policy. Concerns regarding Tangmere Strategic Development Location were broadly based on:

- Housing numbers (ranging from 500 to 2000 suggested)
- Infrastructure requirements and funding
- Sustainability
- Wastewater treatment works upgrade
- Green space/environment/biodiversity

Shopwyke

This policy received broad support from most respondents, with some suggesting increasing the number of dwellings to 600. One representation was made in objection to the site, suggesting it could be allocated as a mitigation area for Chichester and Pagham Harbours.

5. Statutory bodies

5.1. The following tables contain a brief overview of the representations received from neighbouring authorities, parish councils and statutory bodies. Further details on the representations can be found in the summaries in appendix 1.

Neighbouring Authorities

Organisation	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	General comments
Arun District Council	Yes	Yes	Detailed the joint working under Duty to Cooperate. Stated they are unable to assist with meeting any unmet housing need
East Hampshire District Council	Yes	No: - Not positively prepared - Not consistent with National Policy	Plan is unsound due to housing numbers not meeting objectively assessed need. Stated they are unable to assist with meeting any unmet housing need

Havant Borough Council	Yes	No: - Not positively prepared - Not consistent with National Policy	Plan is unsound due to housing numbers not meeting objectively assessed need. Stated they are unable to assist with meeting any unmet housing need
South Downs National Park Authority	Yes	Yes	Broad support for the plan - suggested a number of modifications relating to distinction between SDNP and the Local Plan Area The housing shortfall will not be made up within the SDNP
Surrey County Council	Yes	No: - Not positively prepared - Not consistent with National Policy	Concerns about the potential impact of 339 dwellings in the North of the Plan Area on Surrey, in particular regarding education and highways.
West Sussex County Council	Yes	Yes	Broad support for the plan - suggested a number of modifications relating to evidence base

Parish Councils

Organisation	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	General comments
Bosham Parish Council	Yes	No: - Not justified - Not effective	Unsound due to wastewater and drainage issues.
Hunston Parish Council	No	No: - Not positively prepared - Not effective	Plan does not take into account the infrastructure needs of the Manhood Peninsula, as well as lack of employment
Kirdford Parish Council	Yes	No: - Not effective	The IDP and emerging CIL will not deliver the infrastructure required for sustainable development in The North of The Plan Area. The logic behind The Settlement Hierarchy is flawed and inconsistent
Tangmere Parish Council	Yes	No: - Not positively prepared - Not justified - Not effective - Not consistent with National Policy	Insufficient infrastructure being provided at Tangmere SDL – it is a service village, not a settlement hub. More development should be placed at West of Chichester and Southbourne, and a long sea outflow reviewed to improve Apuldram WwTW. FAD permissions should be deducted from the strategic allocation.
West Itchenor Parish Council	Yes	No: - Not justified - Not effective - Not consistent with National Policy	Planning applications should meet the requirements of the Chichester Harbour Management Plan. There is not enough protection for the AONB

Westhampnett Parish Council	Yes	No: - Not justified - Not effective	Westhampnett SDL should be reduced to 400 dwellings due to coalescence. The applications allowed on appeal have not been taken into account.
-----------------------------	-----	---	---

Statutory Bodies

Organisation	Legally Compliant?	Sound?	General comments
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Yes	No: - Not effective	Plan is inconsistent with Havant plan and should say MEETS the policy aims of the AONB management plan
English Heritage	Yes	Yes	Generally supportive, some minor modifications suggested to wording
Environment Agency	Yes	No: - Not justified	Generally supportive, with a soundness change suggested to Policy 12 Apuldram catchment area
Highways Agency	Yes	Yes	The transport modelling evidence suggests that scenarios which include Local Plan development with mitigation and smarter choice measures are likely to provide sufficient mitigation so that residual cumulative impacts would not be severe.
Natural England	Yes	Yes	Generally supportive, suggested modifications to the Habitats Regulations Assessment
NHS Property Services	Yes	Yes	Supportive of the plan
Portsmouth Water	Yes	No: - Not justified - Not effective - Consistent with National Policy	Code for Sustainable Homes level is set too high. Policy 32 does not ensure a sustainable, adequate supply of water to HDAs.
Southern Water	Yes	No: - Consistent with National Policy	Require changes to Policy 16 Shopwyke SDL to clarify wastewater conveyance Request a new policy to cover 'Protection of Amenity' in relation to new development near WwTW Chapter 19 Environment does not promote water efficiency in the northern parts of the District
Thames Water	Yes	No: - Not effective - Consistent with National Policy	Require changes to Policy 9 Infrastructure to cover sewerage/wastewater provision

6. Development Sector

6.1. In September 2013, new draft government guidance (the *National Planning Practice Guidance*) was published which included a method for calculating objectively

assessed housing need. Paragraph 7.10 of the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission 2014-2029* states that as a result of constraints, the *Plan* is unable to meet the full, objectively assessed housing needs.

- 6.2. The development sector have made a number of representations in regard to the soundness of the plan as a result of being unable to meet the full, objectively assessed need. Most representations argue that the *Plan* should seek to provide a minimum 530 homes per year, whilst some consider that up to 590 homes per year should be sought.
- 6.3. A number of representations consider that the Council has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the constraints affecting the *Plan* area are so severe that higher housing numbers could not be accommodated. Others representations argue that the *Plan* fails to demonstrate how the housing shortfall will be met. These are serious comments that present a severe risk to the overall soundness of the *Plan*.

7. Horticultural Development Areas

- 7.1. Comments received from the HDA businesses were critical of the policy approach. Although this does not impact on the soundness of the *Plan*, further background work may be required in order to continue with the current approach as set out in the policy. This would involve monitoring land which is available for development within the HDAs, and an assessment of the capacity and potential need of the horticultural industry in terms of land.

8. Suggested Sites

- 8.1. A number of other sites have been put forward for development, potentially providing between 1220 and 1320 dwellings. These can be viewed in appendix 1.

9. Next Steps

- 9.1. Officers will analyse the representations and produce a schedule of modifications to the *Local Plan*, setting out where changes have been made and the reason for the change.
- 9.2. Members will be asked to approve the submission version of the *Local Plan* at Council on 24 April 2014. If approved, the *Plan* and schedule of modifications will be submitted to the Secretary of State alongside the *Local Plan* for independent examination.

10. Appendices

- 10.1. Appendix 1 – List of suggested development sites
- 10.2. Appendix 2 – *Representations received on the Pre-submission Local Plan Summary* of main issues received.

Appendix 1 – List of suggested development sites (including potential numbers)

West of Chichester

1,600 homes within Plan period (Linden Homes/Miller Strategic)

Up to 3,000 homes (Tangmere PC)

Whole area up to Salthill Road (Parklands Residents)

Westhampnett/NE Chi

Up to 1,100 (CEG)

Tangmere

1,500-2,000 homes (Chichester Society)

Other sites

Highgrove Farm, Bosham - 150-250 homes (BDW Southampton)

Clappers Lane, Bracklesham - 220 homes (5.9ha) (Wates Developments)

W of Hares Lane, Funtington – c100 homes (Langdale Ltd)

Land W of Fishbourne – no number specified but rep shows extensive land ownership (Fishbourne Developments)

Fishbourne – 100+ homes (Taylor Wimpey)

Hambrook – 200 homes (Sunley Group)

Oving: Land S of Shopwyke Road – Up to 100 homes (Eurequity & DC Heaver)

Southbourne – Parish number should be more than 300 homes, land north of Alfrey Close (Church Commissioners)

Eastern edge of Southbourne (N of Cooks Lane) – c100 homes (Pegasus Ltd)

Land between Foxbridge Golf Club & Ifold (20 acres) – c250 homes (Mr Paul Clark)

Chapter 1 Introduction

Who made comments

NHS Property Services Ltd

Mr S Jupp

Manhood Wildlife & Heritage Group

Mr B Lancefield

South Downs National Park Authority

The Chichester Society

Mr N Richardson

Birdham & Earnley Flood Prevention Group

Commercial Estates Group

East Broyle Residents' Association

Arun District Council

Summary of main issues

- The plan is regarded as sound in that CDC have looked at all the infrastructure needs such as wastewater and road improvements and have considered a phase approach to house building with a need to involve developers in sharing responsibility through CIL/S106
- It is unsound to base housing figures and strategic and parish housing figures and locations when SFRA is out of date
- The plan is sound and legally compliant, but could be strengthened by defining specifically where the council and community wish to prevent development taking place.
- There is no evidence of any discussions to assess whether a higher housing figure could have been achievable with cooperation with Arun District who appear to have a surplus of housing supply.
- There is little or no evidence in the Local Plan of significant discussion or cooperation with Havant Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council, or Horsham District Council.
- Recognise the challenge CDC has in meeting its objectively assessed housing needs. Arun DC is unable to meet any unmet need.
- The SDNPA will not be able to meet any shortfall. CDC needs to demonstrate how it has engaged under the DtC to see what scope there is for making up the shortfall
- Refer to the key diagram for clarity on the Plan area/National Park distinction
- Plan is sound, comments made to counter the developers who object to the Local Plan
- Broad support, but concern over the northern parishes being viewed as a “stranded extra”

Implications

The Plan can fail under the Duty to Cooperate therefore the DtC statement needs to clarify what actions have been taken with Hampshire and Surrey authorities in relation to unmet housing need.

Plans must be positively prepared, and should not specify where development cannot take place (NPPF).

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: highly likely

Impact Rating: large

Urgency of action: immediate

Suggested amendments /modifications

Reference to be made to the key diagram to clarify the extent of the Plan area in Para 1.16.

Duty to Cooperate statement to be produced setting out the actions taken with all neighbouring authorities, with clarification on unmet housing need situation. This is crucial for entering examination.

Chapter 2 Characteristics of the Plan Area

Who made comments

Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd

Crayfern Homes Limited

Southcott Homes Limited

C Cobbold

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Support the reference in paragraph 2.32 to the need for the provision of new housing and affordable housing
- Welcome reference to the historic environment
- Requests the description of the characteristics to include specific reference to the Manhood Peninsula
- The characteristics of the Plan Area need further clarification as information refers to both the district as a whole and the plan area

Implications

None to the Plan

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

Make amendments where relevant to clarify which information relates to the plan area as distinct from the whole district.

Chapter 3 Vision & Objectives

Who made comments

Commercial Estates Group
Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd
Crayfern Homes
Southcott Homes
South Downs Society
Eurequity & DC Heaver
C Cobbold
Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd
Councillor Sandra James
West Itchenor Parish Council
English Heritage
D Akerman

Summary of main issues

- Lack of recognition of the role the district plays in the setting of the National Park.
- More recognition needs to be given to the peninsula's almost unique position on the south coast as a rural coastal hinterland which provides habitat corridor creation opportunities between three internationally important habitats: Chichester and Pagham Harbours and the new Medmerry realignment.
- Reference to market towns is incorrect now that the plan does not cover the entire district
- Paragraphs 3.2 & 3.3 should be expanded and clarified to indicate that appropriate growth for both employment and housing development will be accommodated in and around the settlement boundary of Chichester. Requests these paragraphs are amended to set out that appropriate development will be directed to sustainable locations in and around Chichester.
- Too much emphasis on Chichester and its environs and insufficient weight has been given to the contribution the villages west of Chichester, north of the South Downs National Park and the Manhood Peninsula could make towards housing targets and settlement sustainability.
- Paragraphs 3.6 & 3.7 have not made reference to the role that other settlements along the corridor can make to meeting housing need. Request these to be reworded to read: "*Other settlements in the East-West corridor identified as service villages will have an important role in terms of helping to meet the identified needs of the District's residents, particularly in terms of housing and affordable housing*" (Bellway Homes, and Southcott Homes)
- Paragraphs 3.11 to 3.14 have given insufficient thought to the contribution some of the villages to the north of the SDNP. Requests amendments to the plan to allocate more housing and infrastructure to Wisborough Green and Loxwood due to their proximity to the town centre of Billingshurst with its facilities.
- Paragraphs 3.31, 3.35. 3.36 & 4.1: Concerned that the infrastructure at Southbourne, Westbourne, Chidham, and Hambrook is inadequate to cope with existing let alone additional development particularly the Wastewater operations at Thornham WwTW; insufficient capacity at the Bourne Community College; insufficient capacity of local roads and junctions and railway level crossings.

- Impact on Chichester Harbour designation; suggest the Shopwyke area be developed for recreation and wildlife habitats to reduce pressure on Chichester Harbour and the SDNP.
- Disagree with paragraphs 3.9 and 3.16: Selsey is a thriving centre for commercial activities with good access to the A27. Queries the objective of 3.31 Requests that capacity on the A27 be increased for environmental and financial reasons.
- Requests that the Local Plan be amended to say that the housing numbers are maximum requirements. Requests that the Local Plan should address existing infrastructure deficiencies and not exacerbate them.

Implications

The plan is unlikely to be found unsound as a result of these representations however further amendments to this section will be required.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments/modifications

For consistency remove "city and market towns" in the sub title before paragraph 3.18.

Chapter 4 Overall Strategy and Map 4.4

Who made comments

Chichester Residents' Associations Group (CRAG)

Parklands Residents Association

South Downs Society

English Heritage

G Gentle & Sons Ltd

Mr S Jupp

Tangmere Parish Council

Goodwood Estate Company Ltd

Mr Paul Clark

Summary of Main Issues

- Object to overall approach and strategy and consider the Plan is unsound.
- Plan housing requirements based on "demand" rather than "need" - c200homes/year would be sustainable for Plan area, sufficient to meet locally-generated need including for affordable housing, and a reasonable level of net inward migration.
- Strategy relies too heavily on strategic sites promoted by developers and alternative strategies have either not been considered or have not been assessed adequately. Gives insufficient weight to adverse impacts of proposed development in terms of traffic growth, inadequate infrastructure and historic character of the City. Need to preserve close relationship between City and surrounding countryside.

- Consider there appears to have been no effective joint working with adjoining authorities or joint attempt to evaluate strategies such as the possibility of a new settlement or settlements within the general area.
- Plan strategy not consistent with "sustainable development".
- The strategic allocations and distribution of growth have not been adequately informed by landscape and heritage considerations and should be reconsidered once all the necessary evidence is available. Consider that the plan evidence predates the NPPF.
- Plan preparation flawed, due to inadequate involvement of interested parties.
- Disproportionate development proposed in East-West Corridor would adversely impact on the character of Chichester and Tangmere and Chichester Harbour. More development on the Manhood Peninsula (Selsey and East Wittering) to improve infrastructure and ensure their sustainability as not constrained as with Chichester and Tangmere.
- Employment provision is too focused in Chichester and Tangmere. Housing allocations elsewhere in tandem with specific commercial floorspace.
- Balance of development between west and east of City is flawed. Consider that west is less accessible to jobs, transport links, waste-water treatment infrastructure and shopping centres; more ecologically sensitive, would affect the amenities and recreational assets more, and have greater impact on the setting and character of the City. Reference to advantages of the east side of City; access to employment, wastewater treatment facilities, transport facilities and opportunities for coordinating growth and economic development with Arun District.
- Opposes principle of development west of Centurion Way, and considers that whole area between Centurion Way and Salthill Road should be looked at as a whole.
- West of Chichester could accommodate 3,000 new houses if the density were increased. That would allow the bulk of the housing in the plan period to be in the most sustainable location, that is at Chichester City
- Support for the broad brush commitment (4.1) to living within the planet's environmental limits and welcome (5.6) the approach to Areas outside Settlement Boundaries where greater restrictions will apply.
- Overall support but would prefer that under "Environmental constraints" (para 4.4) specific mention of the historic environment.

Implications for Plan

Several representations consider that the evidence on which the Plan strategy is based is inadequate, arguing either that the level of housing needs in the Plan area is overstated and/or that insufficient weight has been given to the adverse impacts of development on the character, environment and infrastructure of the Plan area.

Some representations argue that the Plan strategy is too dependent on strategic sites with insufficient consideration of alternative options. More specifically, some argue that the strategy focuses too much growth at Chichester City or in the Chichester-Tangmere area and development should be spread more evenly (e.g more housing allocated to the Manhood Peninsula).

The NPPF tests of soundness require that the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. Council officers are confident that the SHMA and subsequent sub-regional work on OAN are robust and will stand detailed scrutiny. Development of the Plan strategy has followed several clear stages at which alternative strategies and sites have been tested through consultation (FoSGO, Housing Numbers & Locations, parish housing numbers) which and through the SA process. Council officers are broadly confident that the key evidence on which the strategy is based is robust and that the overall scale of housing development is sustainable. However, prior to Plan submission, it will be necessary to revisit our evidence to ensure that our arguments in favour of the proposed Plan strategy and our reasons for rejecting alternatives remain valid and robust.

A further criticism is that the Council has failed to demonstrate evidence of joint working with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate. In response, the Council can point to strong evidence of close joint working with the Sussex Coast authorities (e.g on housing numbers) and to joint work with other neighbouring areas (e.g the Solent mitigation work). Officers remain confident that we have met the DTC requirements and this will be expanded on in the DTC Statement which the Council is required to submit for examination alongside the Local Plan itself.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: Highly likely

Impact Rating: Large

Urgency of action: Immediate

Chapter 5 Development and Settlement Hierarchy, Map 5.1 and Policy 2 Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

Who made comments

Commercial Estates Group
Hallam Land Management
Neil Richardson
Bosham Association
Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
Tangmere Parish Council
English Heritage
Stephen Jupp
Havant Borough Council
Jill Sutcliffe
Seaward Properties Ltd
Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd
Crayfern Homes Ltd
Southcott Homes Ltd
Goodwood Estate Company Ltd
G. Gentle & Sons
Langdale Ltd
Gleeson Developments Ltd
Sue Talbot
Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver

The Sunley Group
Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Church Commissioners
Church Commissioners & Seaward Properties Ltd
Owners of Land at Meadow Way
Banner Homes
The Garden Centre Group
Landlinx Estates Ltd
Kirdford Parish Council

Summary of Main Issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

Paragraph 5.3

- Add text to say that Bosham and other villages on the same local sewerage system will also require an upgrading of sewerage capacity. (Bosham Association)

Paragraph 5.4

- As strategic development is proposed at Westhampnett, for accuracy and for consistency with the Local Plan Vision, amend to say '*The Plan focuses the majority of development at Chichester city, Westhampnett and the Settlement Hubs of...*' (Commercial Estates Group)

Map 5.1

- The Settlement Boundary for Stockbridge should be amended to show the recent planning permission for residential development. (Stephen Jupp)

Policy 2

- The strategy and settlement hierarchy is too rigid and should be amended to allow for development to be brought forward on suitably located urban fringe sites. (Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver)
- References to Chichester city should be amended to Chichester and its surrounding area. Specific reference should be made to housing development in and around Chichester city. (Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver)

Westhampnett/ NE Chichester SDL

- Until all the necessary evidence is available requests reference to the Westhampnett/ NE Chichester SDL should be deleted in Policy 2. Considers evidence will support the 500 dwellings allocated in the Local Plan for Westhampnett would be more sustainably located at West of Chichester (600 dwellings allocated beyond the Plan period). Or, if this is not acceptable, suggests sustainable expansion of Westhampnett village which would have less impact on Chichester city heritage and economy and without development in countryside gap. Impact of constraints such as noise and airfield activity listed in Policy 17 would not be so severe. Proposes alternative amendment to Policy 2, deleting reference to strategic development NE Chichester and which instead should refer to a new policy for strategic development at Westhampnett in the form of a well integrated extension of the village. *The city will continue to be a focus for major development in the Plan Area, which includes strategic development identified at:*

- *Shopwyke Lakes and West of Chichester "in the form of mixed use urban extensions to the city (policies 16 and 17)" and*
- *"at Westhampnett in the form of a well integrated extension of the village well linked to the city and its facilities (see new Policy X)".*

New policy X: *"land at Westhampnett village (within the area shown on the policies map) is allocated for development, comprising*

- *approximately xx dwellings*
- *community facilities*
- *open space and green infrastructure".(Goodwood Estate Company Ltd)*

Settlement Hubs

- Policy 2 seeks to meet local needs, including workplaces, but for Southbourne, East Wittering/Bracklesham and Selsey there is a failure to provide a requirement for additional employment facilities. (Stephen Jupp)
- Tangmere – should be defined as a Service Village. The Plan does not include other strategic sites that require a settlement to be upgraded in the hierarchy and full investigation is needed as to the consequences and requirements to make the Plan sustainable. There has been no attempt to group settlements that have the capability of being enhanced into Settlement Hubs and evaluating which would be most sustainable. It appears that Tangmere has been singled out for strategic allocation without a sound evaluation to support such a proposition. (Tangmere Parish Council)

Service Villages

- Policy 2 seeks to meet local needs, including workplaces, but for the Service Villages there is a failure to provide a requirement for additional employment facilities. (Stephen Jupp)
- Concern that level of development proposed for Service Villages is not sufficient to deliver community facilities and larger developments are needed to bring forward such facilities. (The Sunley Group)
- Objects to reference to 'small scale' development in the Service Villages. The Settlement Profiles shows variation in infrastructure, services and demand for housing between villages. Support for Birdham as a settlement capable accommodating further development. (Seaward Properties Ltd) Delete reference to 'small scale' development in Service Villages (Banner Homes, Landlinx Estates Ltd)
- Kirdford and Loxwood - the larger service villages in the north of the District have a greater role to play in helping meet the needs of the area. Amend Policy 2 to state that new housing development will be provided for in the service villages to contribute to housing need and delete reference to 'small scale housing developments' to provide the plan with more flexibility. (Banner Homes, Landlinx Estates Ltd)
- The Plan still seeks to ensure good accessibility whilst continuing to identify service villages which provide only a reasonable range of basic facilities or provide fewer of these facilities but that have reasonable access to them in nearby settlements. It is not understood how good accessibility can be ensured and how this element of Policy 2 can be effective. (Kirdford Parish Council)
- Fishbourne - identify as more than a Service Village (Gleeson Developments Ltd)

- Hambrook – support for identification as a Service Village but requests increase housing number to 200 – see representations on Policy 5.(The Sunley Group)
- North Mundham - increase housing number. (Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd)
- Boxgrove – support identification as a Service Village, but request increase housing number in Policy 5 to meet the needs of the District over the Plan period. (Owners of
- Land at Meadow Way)

Settlement Boundaries

- Amend to allow for the consideration of sites outside Settlement Boundaries prior to their review in Development Plan Documents or neighbourhood plans. (Hallam Land Management, Langdale Ltd, Gleeson Developments Ltd, Sue Talbot, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd).
- Further Consultation Draft Local Plan July 2013 supporting text allowed for consideration of proposals adjacent to Settlement Boundaries prior to their review in DPDs or NPs. (Hallam Land Management, Langdale Ltd, Gleeson Developments Ltd, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
- The release of sites will be needed before the review of Settlement Boundaries due to level of development planned and the timetabling of the preparation of neighbourhood plans and the Site Allocations DPD. (Hallam Land Management, Langdale Limited, Gleeson Developments Ltd, Taylor Wimpey UK).
- The absence of a mechanism in Policy 2 to consider proposals outside of Settlement Boundaries is likely to prejudice early delivery of housing at sustainable locations where it is anticipated development will be phased earlier in the plan period. (Hallam Land Management)
- The FAD document provides a means to respond to the housing land supply shortfall, but the reliance on 1999 Settlement Boundaries is ineffective. (Langdale Limited, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd).
- Concern that planning permissions could still be granted under FAD October 2012 document criteria in addition to sites identified in a neighbourhood plan. FAD document at least should not apply in areas that have adopted neighbourhood plans. Edited version of FAD should be included in Policy 2 or rescinded. (Sue Talbot)
- Amend to set out mechanism for review of Chichester city Settlement Boundary to enable urban fringe sites to be brought forward. (Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver)

Rest of Plan Area

- Criteria for development in the Rest of the Plan Area are too narrow and inflexible and likely to stifle appropriate development in the rural area. (Neil Richardson)
- No provision is made for the re-use of rural brownfield sites. Amend Policy 2 to refer to previously developed sites and add an additional policy relating to the redevelopment of such sites in rural areas. (The Garden Centre Group)

Other representations

- Requests amendment of criterion 1 to include “avoiding harm to the natural and historic environment and specific features of historic or nature conservation significance” (English Heritage)

- Southbourne - requests that the level of development allocated takes account of the Havant Local Plan Allocations document Transport Modelling and consultations have been/are being undertaken with HA and HCC, on transport and education requirements. (Havant Borough Council)

Representations of support

- Supports the recognition that Chichester city and the Settlement Hubs are the most sustainable locations for development (Hallam Land Management)
- Supports the designation of Chichester city as a Sub-Regional Centre and also development in Chichester City and key settlements to minimise the need to travel and optimise the use of sustainable modes of transport. (Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd)
- Support for growth towards the settlements in the A27 east- west corridor, including Chichester, Tangmere, Westhampnett and Southbourne. (Church Commissioners, Church Commissioners & Seaward Properties Ltd)
- Supports the identification of west of Chichester as a strategic location for a mixed use urban extension. (Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd)
- Support for focus of development around Chichester city, but Plan should identify additional land at Westhampnett/ NE Chichester. (Commercial Estates Group)
- Supports the identification of Southbourne as a Settlement Hub and as a sustainable location for development. (Crayfern Homes Ltd)
- Support for identification of Service Villages as providing clear policy guidance and as appropriate locations for accommodating new development and facilities outside of Chichester city and the Settlement Hubs. (Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd, Southcott Homes Ltd)

Implications for Plan

- Classification of settlements in the hierarchy. The supporting text to Policy 2 refers to the classification of settlements within the hierarchy as being based on their existing characteristics and intended role through the Plan period, reflecting the Local Plan vision (and strategy), and taking into account of a number of factors. The Settlement Capacity Profiles provide the background evidence to Policies 2 and 5; the Sustainable Community Strategy identifies the Settlement Hubs. It is considered that the settlements identified as Settlement Hubs and Service Villages in the Plan are appropriate in terms of their overall sustainability and existing or potential range of facilities and that the current Service Village category strikes the correct balance, directing development towards more sustainable locations whilst providing flexibility for neighbourhood plans. It is not proposed to amend the Plan in respect of the settlement hierarchy. However, prior to Plan submission, it will be necessary to revisit our evidence to ensure that our arguments in favour of the proposed Plan settlement hierarchy and our reasons for rejecting alternatives remain valid and robust. Please also refer to the implications section under Chapter 4: Overall Strategy. The Plan notes that some Settlement Hubs or Service Villages require additional infrastructure and facilities in order to fully meet the settlement hierarchy definition during the Plan period, and includes reference to Tangmere as strategic development is allocated here, but it is not considered necessary to specifically reference other settlements.

- Small scale development. The reference to small-scale development under the Service Village heading in Policy 2 directly links with the Policy 5 wording ‘*Small scale housing sites will be identified..*’ as the Service Villages will accommodate the parish housing numbers set out in Policy 5. Housing provision in the Local Plan includes the both strategic provision and parish housing sites. Whilst contributing to the overall Local Plan area housing provision, the non-strategic parish housing numbers are planned to help address local community needs. No change to the Plan is proposed, in this respect. Requests for changes to the overall level of parish housing provision and housing numbers for individual parishes are covered in Policy 5.
- Development adjacent to Settlement Boundaries prior to their review in Neighbourhood Plans/ Site Allocation DPD. The Pre-submission Local Plan is supported by the Housing Implementation Strategy which sets out the approach to managing the delivery of housing to 2029. The adopted Local Plan will include sufficient housing provision, phased to provide a five year supply of housing sites. The early preparation of neighbourhood plans has been encouraged, which will include the review of Settlement Boundaries to accommodate the parish housing sites. Prior to the adoption of the Local Plan proposals for residential development will be considered in accordance with the current development plan along with material considerations such as the NPPF, Neighbourhood Plans in preparation and the criteria set out in the Facilitating Appropriate Development Document (FAD), whilst there is a five year housing land supply shortfall. No change to the Plan is proposed.
- Rest of Plan Area. Further work needs to be undertaken in conjunction with consideration of Policy 45 particularly in relation to consideration of the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the rural area and the NPPF/permitted development rights.
- Employment for Southbourne/East Wittering/ Selsey.. Further work to identify employment sites and locations will be undertaken for the Site Allocations DPD and this will need to assess the requirement for new employment floorspace in different locations.
- Amendments to Settlement Boundaries shown on the Policies Map needed to reflect planning permissions will be made when Neighbourhood Plans or DPDs documents are adopted. No change to the Plan is proposed.

Risk to plan

Probability Rating: highly likely

Impact Rating: large

Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

- Amend paragraph 5.4 to say ‘*The Plan focuses the majority of development at Chichester city, Westhampnett and the Settlement Hubs of...*

Chapter 6 The Economy & Policy 3 Economy and Employment Provision

Who made comments

English Heritage

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd

West Sussex County Council

Hallam Land Management Ltd
Goodwood Estate Company Ltd
Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver
Park Holidays UK
Mr S Jupp
South East Coast NHS Foundation Ambulance Trust
The Theatres Trust

Summary of Main Issues

- Evidence base fails to establish why West of Chichester is seen as an appropriate location for B1 floorspace. Don't object to inclusion of employment land at West of Chichester but consider that Council should allow more flexibility on type of employment floorspace allocated on the site.
- Seeks specific reference in Plan to contribution of Goodwood Estate to the local economy. Specifically objects to Policy 3 and seeks the following additional bullet to the existing text: *"Sustainable growth of the local economy will be supported through the provision of a flexible supply of employment land and premises to meet the varying needs of different economic sectors. This will comprise:*
 - *Supporting and protecting the Goodwood Estate, as a key local employer with important tourism effects"*
- Consider that level of Plan employment provision is too low to meet ELR forecast levels, particularly given that the Plan under-provides against OAN for housing. Seek to
 - Review and increase of employment land to be provided during the Plan period (and reappraisal under SA)
 - Set out the mechanism for allocating future employment land, including the review of settlement boundaries to enable the most suitable land to come forward.
- Seek rewording of Policy 3 (4th bullet) to remove "high quality" qualification to tourism economy, as consider this is undefined and highly subjective.
- Consider that employment policies fail to positively provide for additional employment opportunities in settlement hubs or service villages and should specify a requirement for new employment floorspace for each area.
- Consider that Policy 3 wording restricting new employment land and premises to B1-B8 uses is too inflexible and the policy should be reworded to also allow sui generis uses.
- Para 6.3 - Welcomes statement that Plan seeks to protect landscape and heritage assets which will encourage tourism and inward investment.
- Seek clarification that proposed level of employment provision (25 hectares) is in line with that assumed in Chichester Transport Study. If not, then further transport modelling may be required.
- Support policy but seek an additional bullet point stating that care facilities for the elderly can offer a considerable source of employment (specific reference to proposals for Alfrey Close, Southbourne).
- Support policy but consider that wording should be amended to refer to protecting and enhancing cultural and heritage facilities (in line with Para 1.5).

Implications for Plan

The proposed level of employment land is considered appropriate for level of housing currently identified in the Plan, but would need to increase if housing numbers are raised.

Further work to identify employment sites and locations will be undertaken for the Site Allocation DPD and this will need to assess the requirement for new employment floorspace in different locations.

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: Unlikely

Impact rating: Marginal

Urgency of action: high

Suggested Amendments / Modifications

Further work will need to be undertaken in light of some of the comment above and consideration to increase allocation of employment land if Plan housing numbers increase.

Chapter 7: Housing & Neighbourhoods, Policy 4: Housing Provision and Appendix 4: Housing Trajectory

Who made comments

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd

Commercial Estates Group

Seaward Properties Ltd

Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd

Crayfern Homes Ltd

Southcott Homes Ltd

Pegasus Ltd

East Broyle Residents Association

Bosham Association

Mr Philip Loveridge

Tangmere Parish Council

The Chichester Society

Mr Paul Sansby

Bosham Parish Council

Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan Project Team

Havant Borough Council

East Hampshire District Council

Environment Agency

Church Commissioners for England

English Heritage

Mr & Mrs Colin & Caroline Durant

Surrey County Council

Hallam Land Management Ltd

Mr Neil Richardson

BDW Southampton

Gladman Developments

Goodwood Estate Company Ltd

Langdale Ltd

Gleeson Developments Ltd
Fishbourne Developments Ltd
Bloor Homes Southern
Eurequity & DC Heaver
Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Church Commissioners for England & Seaward Properties
Owners of Land at Meadow Way
Mr Stephen Jupp
Wates Developments
Banner Homes
Landlinx Estates Ltd
Mr Mark FitzGerald (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
Mrs Alice Smith
The Sunley Group

Summary of Main Issues

Overall housing numbers are too low

- Plan fails to provide for full objectively assessed housing needs.
- More rigorous approach/robust evidence required to demonstrate that Plan cannot meet OAN
- Plan must indicate how any shortfall will be met through DTC
- Plan should seek to provide for higher end of OAN range (reference to Brighton & Hove inspector's report)
- Housing target should be expressed as a minimum figure.
- The Plan cannot assume level of housing provision in SDNP given environmental constraints and timescale for the SDNP Local Plan, therefore the Plan should provide full objectively assessed needs for the District (several references to East Hants LP examination).
- Plan makes insufficient provision for historic under-delivery.

Overall housing numbers are too high

- Housing numbers are too high.
- Assessment of OAN is flawed
 - Assumes continuation of past levels of in-migration
 - Is market led, therefore based on demand not need
- Housing numbers, strategic allocations and distribution have not been adequately informed by landscape and heritage considerations.
- Plan relies on evidence that is out-of-date and pre-dates the NPPF.
- Assessment of housing needs is flawed as based on SHMA area only
 - Housing market assessment should include Portsmouth/Southampton as well as coastal West Sussex
 - No evidence of substantive cooperation or discussion with Hampshire authorities, Horsham DC etc
 - SHMA should be based on Chichester District and surrounding districts, not Sussex Coast area
- Assessment of housing needs adopts a top-down methodology based on South East Plan, ignoring recent Government changes to planning system and localism

General comments on phasing

- Plan provides insufficient flexibility against non-delivery or delays in housing delivery
 - Plan should make provision for 20% surplus above identified policy requirements.
- Plan should phase housing asap to maximise delivery:
 - West of Chichester
 - Development at Southbourne should be phased earlier in Table 7.2
 - Promote early delivery of sites identified in Kirdford & Loxwood NPs
- Early development needed to address 5YHLS shortfall, therefore suitable sites in conformity with the Local Plan should not be delayed pending adoption of Site Allocations DPD
- Table 7.1 – Amend to allow earlier development at West of Chichester
- Para 7.22 – Amend to state that, where possible, sites will be brought forward earlier than shown to ensure the delivery of housing and affordable housing at the earliest reasonable opportunity.
- Figure 7.1 - Object to arrow implying that West of Chichester SDL could be brought forward before 2019, as no basis for treating this site differently to the other SDLs.
- Table 7.2 - West of Chichester should be amended to remove "Development requires expansion/upgrade of Tangmere WwTW" and "Post-2019"
- Table 7.2 - Development at Southbourne should be phased as 'Pre-2019' rather than 'From 2014'

Comments on Appendix 4: Housing Trajectory

- West of Chichester should be phased to start delivering housing before 2019
- Westhampnett/North East Chichester SDL provision should be increased to 1,100 homes
- Parish housing sites not capable of delivering by 2015/16 if dependent on preparation of Site Allocations DPD
- Housing sites gaining permission through FAD should be offset against strategic allocations (e.g. at Tangmere) as applies to parish housing

Reps promoting specific housing sites

- The Plan strategy is inflexible and fails to maximise suitable housing opportunities in the Plan area:
Housing numbers should be increased on allocated Plan sites
 - West of Chichester (additional 600 homes)
 - Westhampnett/NE Chichester (up to 600 additional homes)
 - Tangmere
- Additional sites should be allocated
 - Highgrove Farm, Bosham (150-250 homes)
 - East edge of Southbourne
 - W of Hares Lane, Funtington
 - Land W of Fishbourne
 - Land S of Shopwyke Road
 - At Southbourne

- Clappers Lane, Bracklesham (220 homes)
- Land between Foxbridge Golf Club and Ifold

Comments on wastewater capacity

- Don't agree that strategic developments are prevented from coming forward before 2019 by wastewater capacity issues.
- Local Plan references to waste water capacity (in Para 7.8, 7.18 etc) should be less specific to allow for the fact that Southern Water is investigating a variety of options for waste water disposal in the area and not only improvements to Tangmere WwTW.
- Re Para 7.17, no evidence to support proposed solution of upgrading Tangmere WwTW (compared to long sea outfall for Apuldram WwTW which is recommended in the Wastewater Treatment Options Study) or to demonstrate that Tangmere upgrade is technically feasible/financially viable
- Harts Farm WwTW (serving Bosham area) is at capacity and should be subject to same restrictions as apply to Apuldram WwTW in Policy 12.
- Consider that Tangmere WwTW is unsuitable for expansion and a new WwTW (at Bognor Road Oil Depot site) is needed to serve proposed development in Chichester and Arun.

Comments on other constraints

- Don't agree that development at Chichester is constrained by traffic congestion, since the Plan identifies a package of measures funded by development which will address this.

Other comments

- Seek allocation of housing land for self-build projects, individual or community self-build.
- Concerned over impact of 339 homes planned in north of Plan area on Surrey highways and education.
- Too much emphasis on development in East-West Corridor. More development should be allocated in Manhood Peninsula
- Infrastructure issues need to be addressed before further housing development

Representations of support

- Pleased to see reference to Chichester Water Quality Group and wastewater capacity constraints. Support phasing of housing delivery in line with provision of necessary wastewater infrastructure.
- Support Plan in respect of phasing and delivery of housing at Southbourne through NP process.
- Re Para 7.7, support recognition of the national significance of Chichester and need to heritage and setting of the city.

Implications for Plan

Overall housing numbers

There is strong divergence in the comments on overall housing numbers. The reps from promoters and developers almost unanimously argue that the Plan housing target is too low and fails to meet objectively assessed needs. Most representations argue that the Plan should seek to provide a minimum 530 homes/year, whilst some also consider that higher numbers up to 590 homes/year should be sought. A number of reps also consider that the Council has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the constraints affecting the Plan area are so severe that higher housing

numbers could not be accommodate. Others also argue that the Plan fails to demonstrate how the housing shortfall will be met. These are serious comments that present a serious risk to the overall soundness of the Plan.

Several reps, mainly from local amenity and residents groups, argue that the Plan housing numbers are too high. Their arguments are based on assertions that the Council's assessment of future housing requirements through the SHMA is flawed and/or the housing figures take insufficient account of the character, environment and infrastructure of the Plan area. Council officers are very confident that the SHMA and subsequent sub-regional work on OAN are robust and will stand detailed scrutiny. Similarly officers are confident that the Plan makes satisfactory provision to meet additional infrastructure requirements and that the overall scale of housing development is sustainable.

Comments on development phasing

Several comments on phasing argue that the Plan provides limited flexibility and does not go far enough to ensure early delivery of housing to meet the current shortfall. However, the main factor limiting early housing delivery is wastewater capacity. The preferred solution supported is an upgrade of Tangmere WwTW to be brought forward in 2019.

There may be scope for minor rewording to provide stronger and more positive support for bringing forward development as early as possible in Plan period.

Specific sites and locations

A number of reps are seeking the inclusion of specific sites or arguing that the level of housing in particular locations should be increased. Most of these options have been previously assessed during Plan preparation, either specifically (in the case of strategic sites) or more generally (in terms of housing numbers in particular parishes and settlements). Prior to Plan submission, it will be necessary to revisit our evidence to ensure that our arguments for rejecting alternative options remain valid.

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: Highly likely

Impact rating: Severe

Urgency of action: Immediate

Suggested Amendments / Modifications

Possible scope for minor rewording to provide stronger and more positive support for bringing forward development as early as possible in Plan period.

Amend Figure 7.1, which is now inconsistent with wording elsewhere in Plan relating to phasing of SDLs.

Chapter 8: Transport, Access and Communications and Policy 8: Transport and Accessibility

Who made comments

Mr Keith Simpson

Mrs Carolyn Cobbold

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
Mr Paul Wreyford
Hallam Land Management Ltd
South Downs Society
Park Holidays UK
Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
Highways Agency
Mr Don Kent
ChiCycle & 20's Plenty for Chichester

Summary of Main Issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

- The proposals for relatively minor improvements to A27 junctions contradict earlier Highways Agency study which clearly states that traffic demand will only be managed by major junction improvements (including two grade separated junctions at Stockbridge and Bognor Road). Seeks statement explaining reasons for difference/contradiction between the two studies.
- Insufficient detailed traffic investigation has been undertaken to assess impact of proposed development on local roads in and around Parklands Estate. Need more detailed sub-area traffic model to enable more accurate prediction of local traffic impact from new development to be made and the opportunity to respond accordingly.
- Concerned that Policy 8 provides no opportunity to challenge proposed transport management and mitigation proposals other than at application stage. Wish to see first sentence amended to include reference to the Council involving developers, local businesses and residents in work on transport issues.
- Paragraphs 8.1-8.11 are too vague - Hopes and aspirations should be replaced by positive statements of intent based on current data.
- Plan does not provide adequate sustainable travel and cycling provision in Chichester in the existing city or to connect the new areas to the facilities people will need to use and contains very little detail on safe cycle routes. Consider the expected uptake in cycling and walking upon which this Plan relies is highly optimistic. Needs proper commitment by CDC and WSCC to provide detailed, complete cycle facilities, including plans for cycle paths/facilities all the way along the major roads, plans for safe cycling around inner city gyratories, junctions and roundabouts.
- Consider that developments should prioritise brownfield sites and those adjoining railways and adjacent to the A27, and should avoid greenfield sites or sites south of A259.
- Need to develop traffic scenario solutions that address the underlying problem of increasing queues and flows anticipated between 2009 and 2031 and not just attempt to mitigate the new developments.

Other representations

- Support Policy 8 as worded
- Agree that the measures and improvements identified in paragraphs 8.7 and 8.8 will accommodate the level of development proposed in the Local Plan.
- Consider that transport modelling evidence suggests that scenarios which include Local Plan development with mitigation and smarter choice measures are likely to

provide sufficient mitigation so that residual cumulative impacts would not be severe – however cost of this mitigation package likely to be substantial and will require cooperation between local authorities and pooling of resources. HM Treasury June 2013 announcement on A27 Bypass increases confidence that required works to support Local Plan can be delivered, however we will need to discuss relationship between Local Plan schemes and those to be taken forward by HA.

- Need for detailed traffic studies to support level of proposed development on Manhood Peninsula, as local roads are severely congested during weekdays and weekends between April and October.
- Concerned at impact of major developments close to the National Park and would stress the need for timely delivery of transport infrastructure to enable new development.

Implications for Plan

(Comments in this section should be agreed with WSCC)

- The Plan transport strategy is underpinned by the modelling work undertaken for the Chichester Transport Study and is supported by position statements from the Highways Agency and WSCC.
- The Highways Agency considers that the Plan transport package provides adequate mitigation with regard to the A27 junctions. Their rep distinguishes between the Local Plan measures (purely aimed at development mitigation) and the A27 improvements under Government's June 2013 announcement, whilst highlighting the need for coordinating measures.
- WSCC is satisfied that the transport work to assess different development scenarios is robust and appropriate to inform preparation of the Local Plan. The proposed transport measures are intentionally indicative at this stage. The Plan provides for further detailed transport assessments to be undertaken in masterplanning the SDLs.
- A minor amendment to policy wording could be made to address the point raised by Park Holidays.

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: Unlikely

Impact rating: Large

Urgency of action: Low

Suggested Amendments / Modifications

Possibly include reference to working with local residents and businesses in Policy 8 (to be discussed with WSCC).

Chapter 10 The Environment

Who made comments

English Heritage

Mr S Jupp

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

Tangmere Parish Council

South Downs Society

Kirsten Lanchester

Barton Willmore (Hallam Land Management)

Summary of main issues

- Welcomes and supports the recognition of the quality of the built and historic environment, its protection and enhancement and references to good design, locally sourced materials and traditional construction skills and techniques.
- A new SFRA must be undertaken before the local plan can be taken further, it is vital in order to fully assess locational based policies and housing figures and distribution.

Implications

A Sequential Test on the strategic sites was undertaken using the Environment Agency flood zones. These flood zones and other background evidence has been used to inform the Local Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

No amendments to the Plan

Chapter 13 Manhood Peninsula

Who made comments

Manhood Wildlife & Heritage Group

Summary of main issues

- Plan is sound and legally compliant. The plan needs to include reference to the fact that of the whole District the Manhood Peninsula on its own generates 49% of all tourist income and is a vitally important asset to look after.

Implications

No implications to plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: none

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendments to the Local Plan. We do not have the evidence to support this figure. Chapter 2 mentions the impact of tourism in various Manhood settlements.

Chapter 17 - Housing & Neighbourhoods

Who made comments

Mr S Jupp

Hallam Land Management

Summary of main issues

- The requirement to provide affordable housing as part of extra-care development is not justified. (Stephen Jupp)
- The text on page 159 of the draft Local Plan Key Policies Pre-Submission should be amended to state that the Council will require the provision of affordable housing where the scheme represents housing and not a C2 use. HLM are concerned that there is no specific Policy which relates to housing and care accommodation for the elderly. (Hallam Land Management)

Implications

The Council requires affordable housing contributions on all sheltered and extra-care housing, which are classed as C3. We do not require affordable housing contributions on C2 residential care – this does not cover extra-care housing.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the Local Plan

Chapter 18 Transport, Access and Communications

Who made comments

Mr D Akerman

Mr D Kent

West Sussex County Council

Summary of main issues

- The chapter fails to consider all necessary and relevant transport modes. Future use of the airfield and harbours should be addressed. The safeguarded nature of Goodwood Aerodrome should be acknowledged, in addition to its economic and leisure value.
- Development should be concentrated to the north of the A259, outside the AONB, and close to the A27 and railway stations.
- 18.4: This section should refer to the County Council's parking guidance rather than the tool within it. The current document is 'Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments' and for other non-residential development, this is the 'County Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology'.

Implications

No implications

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Replace reference to the parking tool with 'Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments'.

Chapter 19 The Environment

Who made comments

Mr D Akerman

Sheila Wyers

Southern Water

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd)

Natural England

Summary of main issues

- Climate predictions may well become colder and wetter; therefore emphasis should be on drainage and water-hungry planting. Need to monitor the science of climate to react promptly with policy adjustments but also by-laws and funding.
- Encourage local authorities to promote levels 3 to 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH), or equivalent water efficiency levels. Separate policy on water efficiency to ensure that there is no policy gap should the Code be replaced as the main focus of Policy 40 is carbon reduction.
- Amend paragraph 19.1 as follows – "... accommodating the development needs **where appropriate** within environmental and landscape limitations.
- It is not credible or robust to require developments to make provision for ecological corridors which do not exist. It is not justified to formulate a policy requirement on the assumption that the evidence will follow.
- Key policies are sound, welcome the commitment in paragraph 19.51 to "identifying and mapping components ". The term SANGs seem at odds with what is being proposed, suggest "alternative recreational space".

Implications

Policy 40 states that proposals achieve a minimum of Level 4 CfSH from 2013 to 2016 or equivalent replacement national minimum standard, whichever is higher. This policy applies to water efficiency and a change in title would highlight this.

Agree with using "alternative recreational space".

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Amend title of Policy 40 to "Environmental Sustainability". Amend paragraph 19.65 and Policy 7 by deleting "SANGs" and replacing with "alternative recreational space"

Chapter 20 Health & Wellbeing

Who made comments

Southern Water

Summary of main issues

- A new policy should be incorporated to ensure conformity with paragraph 120 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Implications

This is covered by criteria 4 of Policy 33 – New Residential Development

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to policy

Appendix 1 Green Infrastructure

Who made comments

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd)

Darryl Hemmings (West Sussex County Council)

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of main issues

- Welcome the emphasis on Green Infrastructure.
- Support the aims of the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy but have concerns regarding the evidence base
- The 'Cycling, Walking, Bridleways and the Strategic Sites' section emphasises the importance of sustainable modes of transport and reducing car use and would be better integrated into the Local Plan transport sections or a separate part of the evidence base.
- Map A.8: should be updated to include the existing cycle route south of the A27 (as shown on Map 12.3).
- Para A.51 agree that pedestrian/cycle links are important, but object this being best achieved via linking the SDL across the River Lavant.
- Para A.52 object that linking the SDL to the city via Westhampnett Road is significantly less attractive and safe than the routes identified under paragraph A.51.
- Para A.53 accept that links from Tangmere to Chichester will be important, but object to improvements being identified as 'essential'.
- Object to the linkages shown on this Map, the link from the south western corner towards Barnfield Drive and the omission of the link from Madgwick Lane to Priory Road utilising existing footpaths and cycleways.

Implications

The maps are indicative and aspirational, connectivity between the SDLs will be fully explored through the development of masterplans and neighbourhood plans.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work will be undertaken following availability of evidence and connectivity between the SDLs will be fully explored through the development of masterplans and neighbourhood plans.

C Appendix 3 Evidence Base Studies

Who made comments

Kirsten Lanchester

West Sussex County Council

Summary of main issues

- The [Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve Management Plan \(2013-2018\)](#) is not available to the public.
- This should include reference to West Sussex County Council Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments (2010).

Implications

The [Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve Management Plan \(2013-2018\)](#) is produced by the RSPB. It is their policy not to publish management plans on their website, but these documents are available to the public upon request.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add a sentence to say “document available upon request to the RSPB”.

Add the West Sussex County Council Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments (2010).

Appendix 5 Appropriate Marketing Guidance

Who made comments:

Mr S Jupp

Summary of main issues

- E9 – there is no guidance as to the considerations for ‘temporary’ dwellings such as a mobile home for a new enterprise, such considerations should be included
- E10 there are two bullet points. The word leading from one to the other should be ‘or’ and not ‘and’

Implications

None to the Plan

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments/modifications

The wording will be revisited

Map 1.1 Coastal West Sussex Strategic Planning Board

Who made comments

Mr P Clark

Summary of main issues

- Promotion of new housing site
- Promoting a 20 acre site for housing development between Foxbridge Golf Club and the settlement of Ifold.

Implications

No implications for the Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

No amendment to the Local Plan.

Map 12.5 West of Chichester Strategic Development Location

Who made comments

Philip Loveridge

Tangmere Parish Council

Mr P Sansby

Summary of main issues

- Unclear how the housing numbers were derived, requests West of Chichester SDA removed from the Plan.
- Most sustainable location so numbers could be increased beyond the 1,000 proposed if the long sea outfall is implemented.

- Adverse impact on safety, environment, sustainability, employment, traffic, existing communities, & Chichester Harbour.
- Inadequate existing & planned infrastructure citing: secondary schools; employment; rail capacity; leisure provision; pedestrian facilities; and transport.
- Long sea outfall wastewater option should be re-assessed, as it is preferable to an upgrade to Tangmere WwTW.

Implications

No implications for the map

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: None

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendments to the Local Plan.

Map 21.7 Tangmere HDA

Who made comments

Mr P Sansby

Summary of main issues

- The map does not show the proposed brown field housing sites and the required buffer or the latest glasshouse developments. It should be updated to show this information.

Implications

The map indicates the changes to the Tangmere HDA following the adoption of the Local Plan in April 1999. The latest glasshouse development will be shown when the OS base is updated.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the Map 12.7, this map will be superceded by the Chichester Local Plan:Key Policies 2014-2029 Policies Map.

Map 13.2 East Wittering and Bracklesham Strategic Development

Who made comments

C Cobbold

Summary of main issues

- The plan is sensible and sound and should not be further undermined by developers.

Implications

None

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the Local Plan.

Map A8 Connectivity to Tangmere

Who made comments

West Sussex County Council

Summary of main issues

- This map needs to be updated to include the existing cycle route south of the A27 (as shown on Map 12.3).

Implications

The existing cycle route can be added.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: Low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Update the existing cycle routes from West Sussex County Council

Map A9 Connectivity between the SDLs

Who made comments

Mr P Sansby

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of main issues

- Does not reflect the cycle track proposals contained within the Tangmere Parish Plan. Tangmere Road adjacent to Westbourne House School is too dangerous for use as a cycle path, is the route to the south of the A27 necessary? Extension and maintenance of the existing cycle track would provide much better value for money. Show the proposed cycle route to Barnham along the perimeter track and concentrate on extending the existing cycle route into Westhampnett and on into Chichester.

- Object to the linkages indicated, most notably the link from the south western corner of the SDL towards Barnfield Drive and the omission of the link from Madgewick Lane to Priory Road utilising existing footpaths and cycleways. Amend Map A.9 to delete the link from the south west corner of the SDL and to identify the key link from Madgewick Lane to Priory Road.

Implications

Connectivity between the SDLs will be fully explored through the development of masterplans and neighbourhood plans.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

Connectivity between the SDLs will be fully explored through the development of masterplans and neighbourhood plans.

Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Who made comments

Mr C Mead-Briggs

The Itchenor Society

West Itchenor parish Council

Mr N Richardson

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic)

Neame Sutton Limited (Southcott Homes Limited)

Neame Sutton Limited (Crayfern Homes Limited)

Neame Sutton Limited (Bellway Homes [Wessex] Limited)

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Barton Willmore (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Gleeson Developments Ltd

Summary of main issues

- Contrary to the NPPF and “*wherever possible*” should be omitted from the policy. Should refer to a restriction on the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ where the application is on land within an AONB.
- It is unfortunate that in several parts of this Local Plan including those relating to housing and development in the countryside, the positive spirit and approach advocated by NPPF (03/2012) is not apparent.
- Support the inclusion of this policy

Implications

The policy is in line with the NPPF and is a direct quote from the Planning Inspectorate and is encouraged to be incorporated in emerging Local Plans.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy

Chapter 7 and Policy 5 Parish Housing Sites 2012-2029

Who made comments

Chapter 7

Bosham Association

Bosham Parish Council

Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan Project Team

Seaward Properties Ltd

Bellway Homes (Wessex) Ltd

Southcott Homes Limited

Westhampnett Parish Council

Pegasus Ltd

Langdale Limited

Gleeson Developments Ltd

Fishbourne Developments Ltd

Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaver

The Sunley Group

Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd – issue covered under Policy 16

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Owners of Land at Meadow Way

Stephen Jupp

Banner Homes

Landlinx Estates Ltd

Alice Smith

Summary of Main Issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

Paragraph 7.29

- Allow all new dwellings to count towards the targets. Only counting development of 6+ houses is not appropriate for the villages.
- No rationale is given for the guideline of 6+ dwellings in paragraph 7.29 and unless this is modified the result would inevitably be a housing number well in excess of 50 dwellings. Any development which increases the housing stock by one dwelling or more should count towards the target given for Bosham in the Local Plan.
- Taking into account landscape and drainage infrastructure constraints, the 50 homes proposed for Bosham Parish can be achieved only by including sites where in some cases the number of houses may be less than 6.

Policy 5

Specific needs of local communities

- Objects to wording "to address the specific needs of local communities". Whilst local needs will be a material consideration in the assessment of distribution, it is important to understand that the Parish sites are required to contribute to meeting the needs of the District as a whole.

Delivery of housing sites

- Delivery of housing sites should not be constrained by the requirement that they are allocated in a subsequent Site Allocations Document or Neighbourhood Plan. If a proposed development is sustainable then it should be approved without delay, in accordance with advice contained within the NPPF.

Indicative housing numbers

- Wording is open to interpretation; the Council's assessment of its housing requirement identifies the need for the allocations in Policy 5 to be expressed as a minimum; consistency needed with SDL policies that set out precise housing requirements.
- Replace '*indicative housing numbers*' with '*at least*'
- '*Indicative*' is imprecise.
- The NPPF identifies that Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. Reference to indicative housing numbers does not provide sufficient flexibility.

Increase Parish Housing Numbers

- Increase parish housing numbers/ parish housing numbers too low.
- Proposed numbers for many villages are very low and will not aid their sustainability between 2014 and 2029. Policy 5 says the allocations are to meet the specific needs of the local community but the figures do not reflect this.
- Strategy around Chichester allocates either large strategic sites or very small sites. Suggests review the opportunities for development to come forward within the urban fringes of Chichester.
- Proposed housing numbers total should be increased to ensure the Council has at least a 20% surplus above the total requirement for the District. Review the SHLAA capacity information and increase the settlement allocations accordingly. See also comments on Tables 7.1 and 7.2.
- Overall housing numbers should be increased, in particular for Parishes in the East-West Corridor.
- Parish housing numbers derived from evidence in the Settlement Capacity Profiles provides a broad indication of sustainability and strategic infrastructure constraints, the capacity of a settlement can only satisfactorily be established through a site by site analysis through the SHLAA and Site Allocations DPD /Neighbourhood Plans.
- The sustainability criteria of each settlement places little weight on any settlements with a railway station - such settlements should receive a higher figure, as development within them is more sustainable.

East-West Corridor

- Boxgrove
 - increase housing number and/or there should sufficient flexibility in Policy 5 to allow for suitable sites to come forward should the proposed 25 homes be exceeded. The village is sustainable, with access to a range of facilities and services; the southern part could contribute to the District's future housing land supply.
- Chidham & Hambrook

- increase housing number from 25 to 200 which could potentially enable the delivery of community facilities such as sports facilities and open space and would not have an adverse impact upon the integrity of the Chichester Harbour SPA.
- Nutbourne - increase housing number, the settlement has a railway station and development is more sustainable.
- Fishbourne
 - provides additional opportunities without infrastructure and environmental constraints
 - increase housing number to at least 100 dwellings; highly sustainable village, free from the WwWT embargo. Fishbourne's housing provision should look beyond very local needs, contributing to the wider District level provision of homes and services.
 - has a greater role to play in meeting the Districts housing requirements. Fishbourne is a sustainable location without infrastructure and environmental constraints. Suggests housing site West of Blackboy Lane.
- Oving
 - Increase housing number to up to 100 to enable housing development to come forward on land south of Shopwyke Road (on its own or as part of a mixed use development with employment development). Site would provide opportunity to consolidate existing community, within Oving parish, but should be considered as an urban extension to Chichester city.
- Southbourne
 - Increase housing numbers in Policies 4 & 5 to ensure the Council meets objectively assessed needs; settlement is a highly sustainable location. Development of the eastern edge of Southbourne could see significant numbers coming forward without compromising the area. Suggested housing site north of Cooks Lane.
- Westbourne
 - has capacity to sustainably accommodate more than 25 dwellings.
 - there are additional opportunities in the absence of infrastructure and environmental constraints.
- Funtington
 - Increase housing numbers in Policy 4 to ensure the Council meets objectively assessed needs Suggested housing site at Hares Lane.

Manhood Peninsula

- Birdham
 - allocated 50 dwellings, but has an immediate need for 52 dwellings. This figure makes no allowance for future needs, setting a higher figure would help promote economic growth in line with the principles of the NPPF.
- North Mundham
 - increase housing number.

North of Plan Area

- Increase overall housing provision in Policy 4. The housing needs of the National Park and Waverley Borough are not being met. The settlement hubs in the north of the District fall within the National Park. This places more importance on the allocations at the larger service villages outside the National Park coming forward

promptly and where site considerations allow it, scope to increase housing on the allocated Neighbourhood plan sites.

- Kirdford
 - increase housing number through a new strategic allocation of 80 dwellings on land north of Kirdford Growers, phased from 2014, subject to sufficient waste water capacity being available. The site is allocated in the Kirdford Neighbourhood Plan for 45-50 dwellings and phased over a 20 year period.
- Loxwood
 - retain allocation of 60 dwellings to help meet the needs of the National Park.

Other comments on Parish Housing Numbers

- Westhampnett & Chichester city
 - delete Policy 17 (Westhampnett/ NE Chichester SDL). The 500 homes proposed as part of the SDL could be achieved on smaller scale sites. Amend Parish Housing Numbers for Westhampnett to indicate 250 dwellings (off Madgwick Lane). Parish Housing Number for Chichester city is currently 150 dwellings (allows for development west of River Lavant, within Chichester city boundary). 100 dwellings have also been granted planning permission at Maudlin Nursery.

Footnote 1

- Delete Footnote 1. The footnote as drafted predetermines that the later stages of the plan process will not need to explore edge of settlement locations and consequently places an unfair and unreasonable restriction on both the Neighbourhood Planning Process and the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. The Plan should be drafted flexibly to enable housing deliver at the most appropriate location, timed to limit the impact from the potential delays in delivering the SDLs.

Other representations

- Westbourne - growth needs to be carefully planned to prevent coalescence between Emsworth and Westbourne. Development above this number may be limited by Thornham WwTW capacity and this should be referred to in the text as a potential constraint.
- Wisborough Green – proposed development and facilities should take account of the village context including the Conservation Area and international landscape designations.

Implications for Plan

Sites of size less than 6 dwellings. The Local Plan housing provision figures include a Small Sites Windfall Allowance for small sites of under 6 dwellings. In exceptional cases, a flexible approach is suggested on the size of sites identified in neighbourhood plans, particularly in parishes with a very low parish housing requirement. However, sites identified in neighbourhood plans should generally be for 6 or more dwellings, reducing the likelihood of double counting identified sites against the windfall allowance and therefore not compromising the justification for the windfall allowance required by the NPPF. If no separate windfall allowance were made, small unidentified sites would still continue to come forward over and above

and would be likely to result in higher overall levels of housing. No change to the Plan is proposed in this respect. However, for clarification it is suggested that a sentence is added to paragraph 7.29 to explain that sites of less than six dwellings are included in the windfall allowance.

Specific needs of local communities. The housing provision in the Local Plan includes the both strategic provision and parish housing sites. Whilst contributing to the overall Local Plan area housing provision, the non-strategic parish housing numbers are planned to help address local community needs. No change to the Plan is proposed.

Parish housing numbers. A number of representations are seeking to increase the level of housing proposed in particular parishes (some suggest specific sites) and/or revise or delete the '*indicative*'. Most of these options have been previously assessed during Plan preparation, in terms of housing numbers in particular parishes and settlements. Prior to Plan submission, it will be necessary to revisit our evidence to ensure that our arguments for rejecting alternative options remain valid.

Representations made concerning the delivery of housing sites are dealt with under Policy 2.

Representations made seeking an increase in the level of overall housing provision in the Local Plan are dealt with under Policy 4.

Risk to plan

Probability Rating: highly likely

Impact Rating: severe

Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add to end of paragraph 7.29: '*Sites of less than six dwellings are taken into account in the Small Sites Windfall Allowance as set out in Table 7.1*'.

Policy 6 Neighbourhood Development Plans

Who made comments

Hallam Land Management Limited

Pegasus Ltd

Gleeson Developments Ltd

Banner Homes

Landlinx Estates Ltd

Summary of main issues

- Neighbourhood Planning should not be relied upon to deliver housing need, because it may not be adopted or identify enough housing provision.
- The Level of housing on the eastern edge of Southbourne should be increased.
- The District Council should undertake a new SFRA as a basis for future housing numbers.
- The District Councils annualised housing target should be: 590

- The District Council should engage with Neighbouring Planning Authorities in determining an appropriate housing number, and to see if Arun can accommodate some of Chichester District's Housing need.
- The District is failing to meet its housing need under paragraphs 14 and 47 of the NPPF, the annualised housing target should be increased to 525.
- More housing needed in the north east parishes to compensate for the South Downs National Park.

Implications

This policy does not set housing targets. If a Neighbourhood Plan is not adopted housing sites will be found through a Site Allocation DPD.

Neighbourhood Plans have to identify levels of housing in line with the targets set out in Policy 5 of the Local Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: Unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the Local Plan

Policy 7 Masterplaning Strategic Development

Who made comments

Bloor Homes Southern

Mr K Simpson

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd

Environment Agency

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Para 3.36 criterion 14 a more positive statement would be preferred in relation to heritage assets. Welcomes criterion 15 of the policy.
- Para 7.38 - as drafted the paragraph which is supplementary to policy 7 would require approval of a masterplan prior to preparation and approval of detailed plans for a development site. The paragraph introduces ambiguity and uncertainty to applicants there is no detail within the text over how such a prior approval of a masterplan, which would sit outside of the Development Control process, will take place, or who within the Council would be required to approve it (Bloor Homes Southern)
- Para 7.38 - do not agree that masterplans should be approved by the Council prior to the preparation of detailed plans. In practice, the process of drawing up a masterplan for a site runs parallel with the preparation and submission of a planning application and the two processes should not be seen as mutually exclusive (Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd)
- Support for the policy, it provides a wide ranging definition of infrastructure including environmental infrastructure, and this should be provided in a timely manner.

Implications

None to the Plan however there is a need to reword the policy and text to ensure there is no ambiguity for example reference to producing concept statements as part of the masterplanning process.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: Unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required to clarify the objectives of the policy taking into account the above and following suggestions:

- Redraft para 3.36 criterion 14 to read “demonstration of how heritage assets will be incorporated into the scheme, how they and any nearby assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced, and how their significance could better be revealed”
- As currently draft para 7.38 should be deleted or further details should be provided (Bloor Homes Southern)
- Reword para 7.38 as follows - "Masterplans will be prepared by development promoters and local communities, with on-going input from the Council and other relevant stakeholders. They will have to be approved by the Council ~~prior to preparation and approval of detailed plans for the development site~~ as part of the determination of a planning application" (Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd)

Policy 9 Development and Infrastructure Provision

Who made comments

Environment Agency

Kirdford Parish Council

Thames Water

Manhood Wildlife & Heritage Group (MWHG)

South Downs Society

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic

West Sussex County Council

Hallam Land Management

Mr P Loveridge

Hunston Parish Council

Surrey County Council

Mr M Hinton

Mr J Oliver

Summary of main issues

- Support for this policy, it provides a wide ranging definition of infrastructure, including environmental infrastructure, and that this should be provided in a timely manner.

- The Parish Council is not reassured that the IDP and the emerging CIL will deliver the infrastructure necessary to provide for sustainable development within the North of the Plan Area.
- Thames Water considers that the Infrastructure Policy should be amended
- Infrastructure provision is an important consideration given the current constraints in the area and particularly the requirement not to overload the local roads network, flood plains and waste water systems
- Particularly welcome the commitment to safeguarding the aquifer
- It should be confirmed that new development will not be expected to rectify existing deficiencies in infrastructure and that new development should make a proportionate contribution towards infrastructure provision where this meets the tests of CIL Regulation 122/NPPF Paragraph 204.
- The potential need for a secondary school should be highlighted in the Local Plan to ensure that future secondary school provision is fully considered at appropriate stages of the planning process.
- Clarification to confirm that planning obligations will only be sought from development where they comply with all three tests of Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122(2)
- Inadequate existing & planned infrastructure citing: secondary schools; employment; rail capacity; leisure provision; pedestrian facilities; and transport.
- Insufficient account has been taken of the cumulative impact of development on the Manhood in terms of infrastructure requirements.
- Add: *"Where new development generates cross county- boundary impacts on transport, education and other strategic infrastructure, appropriate cross boundary mitigation measures will be resourced to maintain and improve the existing provision."* This would include all modes of transport and all levels of education.
- Address infrastructure funding gap or state developments will be prevented without key infrastructure enablers in place. Consider scenarios where Highways Agency and Southern Water do not provide funding or plans that match current local plan scenarios.
- The plan has failed to address the infrastructure issues properly. Roads and sewage are absolutely key and details must be hammered out.

Implications

CIL is not intended to cover the full costs of infrastructure projects listed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It is to be used in conjunction with other funding sources.

Thames Water comments are covered by criteria 5 of the policy relating to phasing, mitigation and future maintenance of infrastructure.

The three tests of CIL Regulation 122 are set out in Para 204 of the NPPF and do not need to be repeated in the Local Plan. National policy should not be repeated in Local Plans.

Infrastructure providers have been consulted during the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan production process in order to ascertain future infrastructure requirements.

Reference to cross county-boundary infrastructure requirements is made in the IDP. Surrey County Council is consulted on the IDP and is able to make their requirements known through this process. Decisions will be made at a county-level basis.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add in sentence from IDP stating the need for a new secondary school in the supporting text.

Policy 10 Chichester City Development Principles

Who made comments

PMB Holdings

Eurequity Ltd and D C Heaven

English Heritage

The Theatres Trust

Summary of main issues

- In accordance with the settlement hierarchy, greater emphasis should be placed on delivering residential development in Chichester City.
- Policy outlines development principles in the City and does not support new residential development specifically; as a result the policy is not consistent with the overarching vision of the Local Plan or the settlement hierarchy. Nor does it reflect supporting text para 12.3 or NPPF para 23.
- Policy relates only to development within the existing settlement boundary of Chichester. There is an opportunity for urban fringe sites around Chichester to contribute to meeting the Vision of the Local Plan. However there appears no mechanism for bringing those sites forward which makes the Plan unsound.
- Supports references and requirement of all development to have special regard to conserving and enhancing the City's historic character and heritage and existing cultural facilities.
- Reference should be made to maximising town centres to support new residential development should be included
- Either amend Policy 10 to include specific reference to the opportunity to bring forward suitable urban fringe sites for development and the mechanisms for achieving this or a new policy needs to be introduced

Implications

No implications for the Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Policy 11 Chichester City Employment Sites

Who made comments

Eurequity Ltd & D C Heaven
Lindon Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
Mr S Jupp

Summary of main issues

- It is not clear how the Council has derived the specific figure of 15ha, this needs to be clarified. From the evidence base there is an objection based on the grounds that this represents an under estimate of the amount of employment land which needs to come forward to support the economy.
- Para 12.9 states provision will be made for upto 5ha office and up to 20ha for industrial/warehousing totalling 25ha however the policy has an allocation of just 15ha of which 5ha should be office – the policy therefore provides a shortfall of 10ha of industrial/warehousing. This should be clarified.
- The SA is not clear what has been tested and how this has influenced the direction of policies. There has been no assessment of the amount of employment land to be allocated and what sites have been appraised as the Plan does not allocate employment land.
- Suggest land at Shopwhyke is suitable for employment development which accords with the policy.
- Amend first para to reflect that Tangmere Strategic Development Site is also expected to make provision for B1.

Implications

Clarification is needed on how the employment floorspace requirements have been achieved and allocated. Set out within the policy the mechanism for allocating and bringing forward suitable sites

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken.

Policy 12 Water Resources in the Apuldram WwTW Catchment

Who made comments

Portsmouth Water
Environment Agency
Mr S Jupp
Bosham Parish Neighbourhood Plan Project Team
Bosham Parish Council
White Young Green (The Sunley Group)
Mr P Sansby
Tangmere Parish Council
White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic)
Mr D Renton-Rose
Havant Borough Council
Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of main issues

- The Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5/6 for water is not justified or effective. Restrict the requirements for water efficiency to Level 3/4. Provide guidance to developers and the likely changes to the Building Regulations due to be implemented during the period of the Plan.
- Recommend updating this policy reflect withdrawal of the Environment Agency Position Statement and adapting to future changing circumstances. Recommend that the policy title and policy text is replaced as suggested.
- Contrary to paragraph 95 of the NPPF which requires adoption of nationally described standards. The phrase "which ever are higher" and voluntary assessment code is inappropriate. Remove the phrase "which ever are higher" and add a caveat to refer to the government's current review of sustainability standards and how this would impact upon the implementation of the Council's proposed policies.
- The policy is not justified and could result in failures of the Water Framework Directive at Aldingbourne Rife. The SDL sites at Chichester should drain to Apuldram with disposal via a long sea outfall at Earnley. Other works should connect to the LSO to prevent pollution of Pagham Harbour and Medmerry Harbour.
- A proper appraisal and funding for a long sea outflow will remove the key constraint to housing development at the most sustainable location, Chichester City.
- This policy cannot seek to require CsfH Level 5 water measures to be implemented, when the efficacy of those measures are questionable.
- The limitation on foul drainage capacity is a material issue that has not been addressed through Policies within the Plan.
- Reference should be made to headroom at Thornham which affects development in Emsworth and serves Westbourne and Southbourne and inclusion of Harts Farm WwTW (Bosham) in the policy.
- Support the objective of Policy 12 but object to 4th criteria as it is contrary to the Council's Position Statement on Wastewater and Delivering Development in the Local Plan' (October 2013).

Implications

This policy is based on evidence and is supported by the Environment Agency and Southern Water. It specifically addresses the issues of infiltration and increases in

network flow in the Apuldram catchment. The wording “equivalent replacement national minimum standard” address changes in Government standards.

This policy was drafted prior to the withdrawal of the Environment Agency position statement and adoption of the Council’s “Position Statement on Wastewater and Delivering Development in the Local Plan”. Agree with proposed changes.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to policy with regard to CfSH levels. Amend policy title to “Water Management in the Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Catchment” and policy text with *“Proposals for strategic development within the Apuldram Wastewater catchment area should comply with Table 7.2 and the relevant site specific policies with regards to wastewater treatment. Proposals for small scale development in the catchment should be able to demonstrate no adverse impact on the water quality of Chichester Harbour. All proposals for new development in the catchment should conform to the following water management measures:*

- *All new homes should achieve internal water use of 80 litres/head/day (equivalent to the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5). Where this is proved to not be viable the minimum requirement will be an internal water use of 105 litres/head/day;*
- *No surface water from new development shall be discharged to the public foul or combined sewer system; and*
- *Where appropriate development should contribute to the delivery of identified actions to deliver infiltration reduction across the catchment.”*

Policy 13 Chichester City Transport Strategy and Map 12.3 Emerging Infrastructure Package

Who made comments

West Sussex County Council

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd

Mr Keith Simpson

The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd

Mr Philip Loveridge

Tangmere Parish Council

East Broyle Residents Association

Summary of Main Issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

- Policy 13 does not adequately define how the extra road traffic from the proposed development will be accommodated without adversely affecting existing residents
- Map 12.3 - Consider that junction improvement shown at north end of Sherborne Road will only encourage traffic to use Sherborne Road as a through route. A

north-south link road should be provided along west side of the West Chichester SDL with Sherborne Road blocked to through traffic.

- Map 12.3 - Cycle network shown is vague and aspirational, lacking specific plans and costings. Specific plans for cycle routes should be included in this Local Plan.
- Map 12.3 - Land shaded red located immediately north of Westhampnett Road (west of Barnfield Drive) is not all committed development. Need to review red hatched shading to remove land north of Westhampnett Road (known as the Brookhouse Phase 2 development).
- Map 12.3 - Public transport improvement corridors shown are not sufficiently detailed and should follow actual routes or the "key routes" referred to in Policy 13. These corridors should be identified on specific roads or the arrows should be removed from this plan and within the text a statement should be made that the identified strategic locations need to improve public transport to the Chichester city centre.
- Map 12.3 - Should be updated to indicate which routes which are dedicated cycle routes, shared access routes, regular roads considered suitable for cycling, those which aid 'Smarter Choices', and those which are prerequisites for the planned housing development. The map should be completely reworked and the transport analysis repeated to take into account the effect of committed routes only. (Rep refers to a number of specific locations in detail)
- Para 12.19 - Junction improvements funded by developer CIL contributions would be reduced if a larger proportion of the strategic housing requirements are located at the West of Chichester SDL, as most traffic from Chichester travels westwards.

Other representations

- Policy 13 - In the first bullet point, the measures should not be limited to those specified. It is suggested that 'but not limited to' is inserted after 'including'.
- Policy 13 – Policy supported, but the "key routes" identified in the third bullet point for bus lanes and bus priority measures should be clearly defined. This could be done on Map 12.3. If they are not defined then a criteria based approach to how the "key routes" will be identified need to be set out.

Implications for Plan

(Comments in this section should be agreed with WSCC)

None, as WSCC is satisfied that the transport work to assess different development scenarios is robust and appropriate to inform preparation of the Local Plan. The proposed transport measures (shown in Map 12.3) are intentionally indicative at this stage. The Plan provides for further detailed transport assessments to be undertaken in masterplanning the SDLs.

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: Unlikely

Impact rating: Marginal

Urgency of action: Low

Suggested Amendments / Modifications

No amendments to the policy

Policy 14 Development at Chichester City North

Who made comments

Commercial Estates Group
The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd
University of Chichester
Mr P Loveridge
Home and Communities Agency (HCA)

Summary of main issues

- Policy and Para 12.26 needs to be clearer about the connection of development at Chichester City North with planned new development NE of Chichester City (Westhampnett SDL). (Commercial Estates Group).
- Object to the requirement to produce an Area Action Plan. If necessary a SPD akin to that produced for the sites at Chichester City North could be produced.
- In promoting retail uses at Chichester City North through Policy 14 there is no documentation evidence that meets the requirements of para 23 of the NPPF, that sequential alternatives have been considered as part of the plan-making process. The evidence base does not support this allocation for retail use (The Prudential Assurance Company Ltd)
- Policy protection to ensure student housing is delivered on the NHS Trust land; there is a need for a new access to the University; and playing fields are considered important to the character of the area and sports use are retained or are provided locally (University of Chichester)
- The HCA is currently in the process of acquiring 7ha of land to the south of Graylingwell Drive from the Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust which is capable of delivering 150 residential units approx. The HCA supports the principle of residential development; it will explore and consider student accommodation with the University in the new year. The HCA would welcome the opportunity to negotiate the level of open space to be provided in order to maximise the delivery of housing on this strategically important site.

Implications

Further work should be carried out on the drafting of the policy in order to make it clear which land the policy applies to and to consider the representations made.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required to clarify the objectives of the policy taking into account the above and following suggestions:

- Amend last para to read "If required, the Council may consider the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to establish a planning framework to guide future development proposals at Chichester City North and land west of the River Lavant (allocated as part of Policy 17)

- Amend second sentence of para 12.26 to read “In particular, there ~~is~~ may be potential to link future development in the area with planned new development ~~north east of Chichester City~~ on land west of the River Lavant (see policy 17...).
- Delete last sentence “To facilitate this, the Council proposes to prepare an Area Action Plan, which will set out a coordinated planning framework to guide future proposals and development in the area and the rest of the city” and replace with “To facilitate this, and only if required, the Council may consider the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to establish a planning framework to guide future development proposals and development in the area”.
- Delete 9th bullet referring to the allocation of land at Barnfield Drive for retail and employment uses. Reference should specify that proposals for retail development will be subject to assessment under policy 28.
- Amend 5th bullet to read “A new vehicular access to the University, from the east to relieve College Lane which provides an appropriate visual and functional arrival pint to the main University entrance”.
- Add a further bullet to read “Provision of an appropriate level of student accommodation on the former Sussex Partnership NHS land to help meet the expansion objectives of the University”.

Policy 15 West of Chichester Strategic Development Location

Who made comments

Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd
 Darryl Hemmings (West Sussex County Council)
 Steve Ankers (South Downs Society)
 Mike White (East Broyle Residents’ Association)
 Paula Chatfield (Individual)
 Michael Fort (Individual)
 Anthony Hows (Individual)
 Frances Lansley (Individual)
 Richard Childs (The Chichester Society)
 Richard Plowman (Individual)
 Hannah Hyland (Environment Agency)
 Stephen Jupp (Individual)
 Martin Small (English Heritage)
 Paula Chatfield

Summary of main issues

Wastewater infrastructure and phasing

- Support references to: the need for the provision of adequate wastewater infrastructure and that the development would be phased accordingly.

Protection of Heritage

- Support references in paragraph 12.34 to protecting the heritage assets and archaeology of the site and the identification of protecting priority views of the Chichester Cathedral spire as specific issues to be taken into account in planning the development and layout of the West of Chichester Strategic Development Location.

- Support site-specific requirements to “keep land north of the B2178 in open use.....to protect.....the setting of the Chichester Entrenchments Scheduled Monument” and to “conserve, enhance and better reveal the significance of the Chichester Entrenchments Scheduled Monument and other non-designated heritage assets and their settings and to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be harmed or lost”

Support for the SDA

- Support allocation of the SDA (Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd)

North/South spine road and junction improvements

- Paragraph 12.32 on the grounds that: Recent technical work indicates that a north-south spine road has the potential to reduce the traffic impact of development on Sherborne Road. Through the design of the link, it will be necessary to minimise the attractiveness of this route to rat-running via Lavant and the technical work may also reveal a need for improvements to other junctions in order to accommodate changes in traffic flow. It is recommended that, once complete, this technical work is published as part of the Local Plan evidence base.

Representations of objection/requested amendments

Impact on South Downs

- The West of Chichester Strategic Development Location would mean unacceptable levels of traffic passing through the national park
- Concerned about impact of views from the South Downs

Flood Risk

- Concerned about flood risk on neighbouring areas resulting from surface water run-off from the SDA.

Landscaping

- Concerned that the Eastern side of the SDA is only to have key landscaping where it is considered necessary
- The Settlement Policy Area is unclear - it cuts off two areas outside the existing SPA (for sound reasons) with no indication of their future status. These are the existing Bishop Luffa School playing fields and the St Paul's Road/East Broyle green space (at the north end of Sherborne Road).
- There has been failure to recognise the landscape value of the site
- Requests the SDA be designated as Green Belt.

Impact on Chichester Harbour SPA/Ramsar

- It is in conflict with Policy 50 and no effective mitigation is explicitly and clearly stated as a precursor to development and it is not in accordance with Sections 113,114 and 115 of the NPPF

Transport Impacts

- Policy 13 does not adequately define how the extra road traffic from the proposed development will be accommodated without adversely affecting existing residents

- Concerned about adverse transport impacts
- Fifth bullet point of 12.34 - request the end of the sentence is deleted as the need for an improvement to the St Paul's Road/Sherborne Road junction will require detailed assessment. This could be replaced with "and improvements to the local highway network as identified through a detailed Transport Assessment Report that will be required to be submitted in support of any further planning applications on the site". This approach is in line with Section 18.

Housing Requirements

- The housing numbers haven't recognised the constraints of the South Downs National Park; the protected designations of Chichester Harbour and issues relating to flooding, wastewater, transport infrastructure, or the areas natural and heritage assets.
- The housing isn't located close to centres of major employment (Havant to Southampton).
- The allocation goes beyond the Plan period (1600, rather than 1000 homes)
- It is not necessary given the huge number of new developments in the Chichester area - it is building on greenfield land when this could arguably be avoided
- Request deletion of the following wording in 12.32: "Given the likelihood that current wastewater capacity constraints will prevent any development until after 2019, it is considered likely that no more than 1,000 homes will be delivered within the period to 2029. The Plan therefore makes provision for this figure."
- Do not accept the need for development to be constrained to 1000 homes in the plan period and believe the site is capable of delivering 1600 units in the plan period. Request policy 15 is amended as follows:
1,600 homes (~~of which 1000 homes should be delivered during the plan period~~)
- Seventh bullet point of Policy 15 referring to the land north of the B2178 – it is not accepted that development is unacceptable north of the road, but are content not to seek built form on this area on the understanding that the extent of commercially developable land is as per the attached masterplan .

Impact on biodiversity

- The SDA is ecologically important.
- It fails to recognise and protect a recorded chalk stream (a specialist river habitat under the UK BAP rivers and streams habitat action plan and notable under the Water Framework Directive).
- The diverse geology hasn't been properly considered.
- It seems impossible to reconcile a healthy interconnected hedgerow/ancient woodland/stream ecology network with a strategic development of this scale
- The potential for providing a north-south spine road could significantly improve the resilience of Parklands to this development but appears to conflict with biodiversity and heritage conservation (Paula Chatfield).
- It conflicts with Policy 50 with regard to the 5.6 km restriction zone recommended by the Solent Distribution and Mitigation Project. A development of 1,000 to 1,600 in such close proximity to the SPA will result in

a significant increase in the residents recreational use of the harbour area and without further studies

- Concerned about biodiversity of this site.
- Request deletion of 7th bullet point of 12.34 as their ecological surveys don't support these conclusions. Request the Council provides evidence to back the Local Plan wording.
- Requests text of Policy 15, bullet point 5 to be amended to read “• Be planned with special regard to the need to mitigate potential impacts of recreational disturbance on the Chichester Harbour SAC/SPA/Ramsar including contributing to any strategic access management issues (where this meets the tests of CIL Regulation 122 and Paragraph 204 of the NPPF)” ;
- Request Policy 15, bullet point 15 be amended to read “Protect and enhance the existing biodiversity ~~and important ecological corridor linking Chichester Harbour and the South Downs National Park~~ . Any development will need to:”

Heritage

- The SDA is an archaeological priority area
- There has been failure to recognise the heritage of the site.
- The potential for providing a north-south spine road could significantly improve the resilience of Parklands to this development but appears to conflict with biodiversity and heritage conservation.
- Priority views of the cathedral spire should be identified.

Sustainability

- The in combination constraints and impacts outweigh the benefits.
- The SDA will have a serious environment impact given its location.
- It would be impossible for the SDA to become a sustainable urban extension to the city. What benefits it could provide in terms of housing and employment provision would be totally outweighed by the numerous disbenefits to the existing city and to its inhabitants.
- Concerned about importance of this site to the environment.

Access

- It has not been demonstrated that access to the site can be provided without unacceptable harm to neighbouring communities.
- The northern access is on roads that are either over capacity or residential;
- There is no identified southern vehicular access towards Chichester city, as the site is land-locked by the railway and Centurion Way.
- The potential for providing a north-south spine road could significantly improve the resilience of Parklands to this development but appears to conflict with biodiversity and heritage conservation.
- It is difficult to see how the objectives of paras 12.31 and 12.32 could be achieved without the corridor of land next to Old Broyle Road being included in the proposed WCSDL.
- Development of the southern part of the site is not achievable due to access issues.
- Request deletion of reference to further testing as part of an access strategy in 12.32 on the grounds that this work is now complete.

Employment

- No evidence has been given for the economic viability/demand for employment land at this location. Whilst the principle of having employment opportunity associated with new housing is admirable, in practice a significant amount of in- and out- commuting continues to occur.
- There is no delivery timetable for the employment land element.
- Request removal of reference to B1 uses in 12.31 on the grounds that this is inflexible (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd). Request policy 15 is amended as follows: 6 hectares of employment land (suitable for B1 Business uses and other employment generating uses
- Request addition of words “enable access to” before the A27 to paragraph 12.3.

Agricultural land

- The SDA is good quality agricultural land and an expanding population and food security is severely compromised by this proposal.

Wastewater

- There is no evidence that drainage to Tangmere is achievable both technically or viably
- Concerned about wastewater management
- Request additional wording to the end of 12.30 to read: "unless it can be demonstrated (to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and a Sewage Undertaker) that an on-site solution can satisfactorily serve the proposed development." - on the grounds that recent discussions with the EA and SW have confirmed that, in principle, they have no objection to an on-site wastewater solution provided certain criteria can be achieved.

Coalescence with Fishbourne – representation made under Policy 48

- Policy 15 is in conflict with Policy 48 as the SDA was previously identified in the last Local Plan as a Strategic Gap, preventing the coalescence with Fishbourne
- Requests that the SDA be deleted
- Requests that the policy be rewritten to maintain the Strategic Gap

Implications

The plan could be found unsound if a solution is not found to the access issue at the southern end of the site before the plan is submitted. The transport studies also need to be completed prior to submission, so these need to be concluded swiftly so they can be published prior to submission. Resolution of the biodiversity issues also needs to be concluded swiftly and results published.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: likely – if no solution is found to the Southern access

Impact Rating: severe

Urgency of action: immediate

Suggested amendments/modifications

Paragraph 12.31 include words “enable access to” before the A27.

Paragraph 12.34, amend fifth bullet point as follows:

Providing adequate mitigation for potential off-site traffic impacts, including improved access to the A27 and improvements to the ~~St Paul's Road/Sherborne Road junction~~ local highway network as identified through a detailed Transport Assessment;

Amend Policy 15, first bullet point to read:

1,600 homes (of which at least 1,000 homes should be delivered during the Plan period);

Policy 16 Shopwyke Strategic Development Location and Map 12.6 Shopwyke Strategic Development Location

Who made comments

English Heritage

Southern Water

The Chichester Society

Osborne

South Downs Society

West Sussex County Council

Kirsten Lanchester

Paul Sansby

E Lawrence

Mr M Hinton

Summary of main issues

- Support for the policy requirements relating to the historic environment
- Policy 16 would be made sound by the addition of the following text:
Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.
- Support for the policy, with suggested increase to 600 dwellings on the site
- Support for the policy
- The Shopwyke site has identified issues with groundwater (due to the gravels) and this should be specified as an area to consider in the policy requirements. There is also a portion of the site (nearest the existing offices) in flood zone 2, so this could also be mentioned
- Broad support but development should be limited to 500 dwellings to allow sufficient space for Green Infrastructure and a wildlife corridor linking the Downs to Pagham, Medmerry and Chichester Harbours
- Allocate Shopwyke lakes as a mitigation area for the additional pressure on Chichester and Pagham Harbours
- Consider additional options to prevent Shopwyke becoming an isolated community

Implications

Policy 16 is inconsistent with the other SDL policies with regard to wastewater. No implications for plan soundness. The Shopwyke Lakes development already has

planning permission and will not be allocated as a mitigation area. The development will be masterplanned with links to the city.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Sentence to be added to Policy 16: Development will be dependent on the provision of infrastructure for adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment to meet strict environmental standards.

Add sentence in supporting text to Policy 16: The development of the site will be required to fund the necessary wastewater infrastructure linking the site to Tangmere WwTW.

Policy 17 and Map 12.7: Westhampnett/North East Chichester Strategic Development Location

Who made comments

Commercial Estates Group
Goodwood Estate Company Ltd
Westhampnett Parish Council
South Downs Society
Mr M Steel
Cllr Mike Hall
University of Chichester
Elizabeth Lawrence Ltd
The Chichester Society
Environment Agency
Rolls Royce Motor Cars Ltd
Mr S Jupp
English Heritage
Mr P Sansby
Mr M Hinton

Summary of Main Issues

Site promoter representation (Commercial Estates Group)

- Support allocation of strategic development at this location, but object to some specific provisions of Policy 17. Particularly object to restriction of developable area within SDL, preventing development north of Madgwick Lane and east of River Lavant. Consider site has development potential for up to 1,100 homes and that policy is currently unsound, given that the Plan fails to meet OAN.
- Seek amendment of Policy 17 allocating SDL for up to 1,100 homes, together with any consequential amendments to supporting text and any other relevant text / policies in the Plan. This modification should then be consulted upon and Sustainability Appraised (as required).

- Consider such modification could be made by Inspector at Examination (subject to consultation and amended SA), without needing to withdraw the Plan (refer to example of South Oxfordshire Core Strategy).

Specific comments on Policy wording

- Paragraph 1- Object to wording “mixed development”. Consider this inappropriate for the proposed scheme of 500 homes, since community facilities should be provided through off-site contributions. However, ‘mixed development’ may be appropriate for a larger scheme of up to 1,100 homes.
- Bullets 1 & 4 – Object to restrictions on developable area within the SDL and limitation of development to 500 homes. Whilst accepting there are some development constraints, consider that developable area of the site extends north of Madgwick Lane giving potential for up to 1,100 homes.
- Bullet 2 – Seek addition of wording to allow for community facilities to be provided either on-site or through financial contributions to improve off-site facilities.
- Bullet 3 – Object to requirement to provide a linear greenspace along Lavant Valley, which they consider unjustified for 500 homes currently proposed (but would be appropriate if larger development allocated including land north of Madgwick Lane).
- Bullet 5 – Support wording allowing flexibility for community infrastructure to be met through financial contributions to existing off-site facilities.
- Bullet 6 - Consider that green links and associated countryside park, only justifiable in association with development to full potential, including land north of Madgwick Lane.
- Bullet 7- Agree with landscape and noise requirements, but do not consider that these restrict development to only 500 homes.
- Bullets 8, 9 and 10 - Agree with requirements relating to design, setting and views; flood risk management; and road access.
- Bullet 11 – Do not consider that any new pedestrian / cycle links to the National Park or bus only link to Graylingwell Area are reasonable or achievable with policy as worded. However, these could be provided if SDL land developed to realistic potential, including land north of Madgwick Lane.
- Bullet 12 – Agree with need to control development in Airfield Flight Safety Zone, which they assume refers to the safeguarded areas at the end of the two runways.

Comments on development constraints affecting the site

- Floodplain – Accept that areas within 1:100 and 1:1,000 floodplain should not be developed.
- Ecology – Consider that site currently has no real ecological merit and proposed scheme will deliver positive benefits for ecology in local area. (Supporting ecological studies attached to rep)
- Aircraft Safety – Consider that restricted areas only apply to approaches to aircraft runways and do not significantly reduce developable area.
- Landscape – Argue that site is not subject to any landscape designations and that views from National Park are distant and can be mitigated. However, accept that landscape and visual issues should inform development plans. (Strategic Landscape Assessment attached to rep)

- Highways – Do not consider that traffic impacts constrain increased development, since Chichester Transport Study has already tested options with up to 1,200 homes on site.
- Waste Water – Consider that any increased demands on wastewater capacity could be addressed by expanding capacity at Tangmere WwTW or use of on-site measures.
- Noise – Do not consider that noise impacts preclude development N of Madgwick Lane and do not consider that applying a 400m noise buffer to determine areas where residential development is acceptable is technically justified or credible. Even if 400m buffer is applied, there is still considerable land outside this buffer north of Madgwick Lane. In addition, noise monitoring work has shown that substantial existing residential areas (including recent permission at Maudlin Nursery) suffer equivalent or higher levels of noise exposure compared to 400m on the SDL site. (Noise Assessment Report by Cole Jarman attached to rep)

Comments on Sustainability Appraisal

- Argue that SA is flawed since the evidence base used to inform judgements is not clear and some scoring is wrong and/or internally inconsistent. Specific criticisms relate to SA criteria 1A (Biodiversity Loss), 1B (Habitat Mitigation), 5A (Flood Risk / Sustainable Drainage), 8A (Landscape Conservation) and 12A (Quality of Life).

Comments on Map 12.7

- Map 12.7 should be clarified to either reflect the accurate land ownership boundaries or to make it clear that this is a plan for the purposes of general identification only.

Points made by other representations

General comments

- Oppose allocation of site
- Allocated site boundary fails to identify areas proposed for development
 - Boundary should clearly define areas for development and greenspace
- Extent of constraints make site inappropriate for strategic development (

Specific comments on site development potential:

- Developable area too constrained for development of 500 homes.
- Site has potential for no more than 400 homes (250 homes south of Madgwick Lane and 150 east of Chichester city)
- Allocation should be deleted and redistributed to parish housing requirement (including Maudlin Nursery permission) with additional sites to be identified through neighbourhood plan
- Policy 17 should specify that housing will be confined to the southern part of the site

Coalescence & Settlement Pattern

- Development would lead to coalescence of Westhampnett with Chichester city
- Site poorly related to integrate with Westhampnett village
 - Community facilities would not be central to village
- Development would erode the rural character of the area

Flooding

- Policy wording should be strengthened to state that development will not be permitted within the floodplain of the River Lavant.
- Support policy requirement to ensure development away from the floodplain
- Support policy requirement for adoption of a comprehensive approach to flood risk management, including consideration of surface water drainage as part of the masterplanning process

Landscape & Heritage

- Development would cause harm to landscape
 - Development would harm views to/from National Park/The Trundle
 - Policy requirements protecting landscape sensitivity are too weak
 - Would damage setting of Goodwood Estate
 - Would harm setting of Chichester city
- Local Plan should define an area of special landscape protection covering the area.
- Concern that policy requirement for development to be designed with special regard to the Graylingwell Hospital Conservation Area could be used to frustrate development set out in Chichester North Development Brief which provides for university student accommodation.
- Development would harm heritage of local area
- Welcome requirement in policy and supporting text for development to respect the setting of existing heritage assets (Graylingwell Hospital Conservation Area, views of Chichester cathedral spire etc)

Green Infrastructure

- Support policy requirements for green infrastructure
- The site combined with other development in the Chichester area will accentuate recreational pressures at Chichester Harbour
- Support provision of public access footpaths and cycleways, but oppose landscaped country park which would reduce rural character of the area
- Boundary of linear greenspace along River Lavant should be clearly defined

Transport

- Development would lead to harmful traffic impacts, accentuate traffic congestion on local roads and A27 and cause unacceptable levels of traffic through National Park
- Madgwick Lane has no lighting, pavements or cycle paths

Local Economy and Employment

Development would harm local economy and employment

- Would impact on events at Goodwood Estate
- Would impact on specific locational requirements of Rolls Royce

Noise

Objections on issue of noise impacts

- 400m noise buffer would provide inadequate protection
- Noise protection would require more than just physical separation

- Noise buffer would not protect against noise from overflying helicopters and aircraft
- More detailed evidence is needed on noise impacts.
- CDC policy on Airfield noise is inconsistent as cited as reason for refusing Keepers Wood application
- Consider a buffer of 600m is more appropriate for a motor circuit, including provision for physical noise barriers (refer to independently commissioned noise assessment study). This would restrict developable area to just 4.57ha.
- Development in the Airfield Flight Safety Zone should be changed from "strictly controlled" to "prohibited"

Infrastructure

- Infrastructure is insufficient to support planned development, specific concerns related to, Waste water/sewage, Education, Health facilities and Crematorium
- Welcome reference in policy and supporting text to need for provision of adequate wastewater infrastructure and that the development would be phased accordingly
- Wastewater from site should not be transferred to Tangmere WwTW, but to Apuldram WwTW and then discharged to sea via a long sea outfall.

Comments on Map 12.7

- Map 12.7 should clearly define development area and linear greenspace along River Lavant

Comments on supporting text (reps made under East-West Corridor)

- Para 12.44 – Object to statement that noise impacts from Goodwood Motor Circuit/Aerodrome prevent development on northern part of site, as consider that noise is not an absolute constraint except in very limited parts of site. Seek deletion of third sentence.
- Para 12.45 – Fully support wording regarding advantages of location in terms of development.
- Para.s 12.46 & 12.48 – Wish to see wording amended in line with their detailed comments on Policy 17.
- Para 12.49 – Consider that only development on land west of River Lavant relates to sites at Chichester City North and that reference to Area Action Plan should be removed. Propose following replacement wording:
'To facilitate co-ordinated development, and only if required, the Council may consider the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to establish a planning framework to guide future development proposals at Chichester City North and the element of this site which is west of the River Lavant.'
- Para 12.50 - Consider that the reference specifically to additional wastewater capacity being provided at Tangmere WwTW should be replaced with a more general reference stating:
'Appropriate infrastructure will be requisitioned through the normal statutory procedures.'

Implications for Plan

- May need to reinforce our reasons for restricting development to 500 homes

- May need stronger evidence for opposing any development north of Madgwick Lane on grounds of landscape, character and noise)
- Will need strong justification for SDL boundary – need to emphasise the links between the two development areas in terms of masterplanning work, e.g coordinating wastewater, green infrastructure etc
- Need to clarify what we mean in terms of linear greenspace
 - Do we just want pedestrian/cycle routes across the land or publicly accessible green areas?
 - What are we looking for in terms of enhancing biodiversity along the River Lavant corridor?
- Need to clarify if we are still intending to prepare an Area Action Plan for the NE Chichester area (referred to in Policy 14) and how this would coordinate with a masterplan for the SDL?

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: Highly likely

Impact rating: Large

Urgency of action: Immediate

Suggested Amendments / Modifications

Additional supporting text emphasising links between the two development areas and need for a coordinated masterplanning approach to the whole SDL area.

Additional text and possibly policy rewording to clarify what we require in terms of linear greenspace along the Lavant Valley. Further work is being undertaken on Policy 14 and will be reflected in this policy if changes are made.

Policy 18 - Tangmere Strategic Development Location

Who made comments

Church Commissioner for England and Seaward Properties Ltd

Bloor Homes Southern

English Heritage

Pegasus Ltd

South Downs Society

Tangmere Parish Council

The Chichester Society

Mr and Mrs Priestly

Ms S Wyers

Mr S Jupp

Mr D Blythe

Mr Paul Sansby

Summary of issues:

- Objection to overall housing number and the suggestion that the Plan is not meeting its objectively assessed needs .
- Reference is made to the 'Vision Strategy' further work will be carried out in conjunction with the Parish Council, the community, key stakeholders and other members of the consortium to refine the vision and prepare a masterplan.

- Tangmere is defined as a Settlement Hub, when it is a Service Village
- Supports reference to the identification/protection of views of Chichester Cathedral Spire, heritage assets, conserving and enhancing the setting of historic village, and the heritage of the WWII airfield as specific issues to be taken into account delivering the Tangmere Strategic Development Location.
- There is land available at Tangmere to accommodate in excess of 1000 homes.
- No evidence has been provided to support the need for a new village centre, enhanced recreation, education or healthcare. These would only be required if 1000 new houses were built on greenfield land which is not sustainable.
- Suggested that development should be restricted to 500 units due to the impact on the A27.
- Tangmere could be a centre in its own right delivering 1500 – 2000 homes in the Plan period. Reference is made to the relocation of the museum, improvements to the bus service and sustainable footpath/cycle networks.
- An assessment was undertaken on the grade separated junction of the A27/A285, it was concluded that the junction will continue to operate within capacity with development of 1000 dwellings.
- An assessment should be carried out to identify the infrastructure and facilities required to make Tangmere more sustainable. It is thought if Tangmere were to be sustainable it would require facilities akin to Southbourne i.e. train stop, secondary school, indoor leisure complex, employment opportunities and retail facilities. If this was produced and costed, it is believed that there are insufficient funds available to provide such infrastructure. There is a risk that strategic development will occur without the required infrastructure.
- Tangmere is not located in a sustainable location. New housing and commercial development will be dependent upon the car. Strategic locations should have close access to the south coast railway line. The Council has failed to justify the allocation in an unsustainable location when more sustainable locations exist.
- Growth at Tangmere is dependent on the expansion of the waste water treatment plant. This discharges into the Aldingbourne Rife which as a chalk stream should dry out in summer.
- Reference is made to the Water Framework Directive and the standards for the Aldingbourne Rife. Alternative solutions need to be considered for Tangmere which should include work on the Arun housing development at Barnham and the use of the Ford WwTW and its associated long sea outfall. The sustainability appraisal rates Water Treatment as having a significant impact and treatment at Tangmere does not resolve this issue.
- Reference is made to the Aldingbourne Rife bursting its banks (3/1/14) and flooding houses around Lidsey/Feltham. With additional houses to be built in the Arun/Adur area discharging into the Aldingbourne Rife the expansion of the WwTWs is questioned. The only viable alternative is to build a new treatment plant at the Fuel Depot Site using the Pagham Rife for sewage and surface water discharges.
- No mention of the brown field allocations within the Tangmere Parish Plan and the planning permission for the housing on the Hangers Site (160 houses)

- The concrete apron could accommodate a further 160 houses, giving 320 in total, this would provide all the community facilities that Tangmere requires.
- Potential landscape impacts have been understated.
- Development of the of the greenfield element of the development would be conspicuous from the Trundle.
- Consideration should be given to additional green space i.e. village green/playing field to the West of Tangmere village of at least an equal area of parkland, extending the current conservation area to include the whole of Church Lane, St Andrews Church and churchyard and Saxon meadow development and extending St Andrews churchyard and providing woodland to the south west of Tangmere in order to preserve the character of the churchyard.
- The loss of greenfield sites and associated biodiversity should be recorded in a national database to help monitor the larger scale accumulative changes in land use and biodiversity, and to improve understanding of the environmental impacts of urban development in rural areas.
- New housing should not be permitted up to the boundary of the churchyard without a green separation zone or corridor. Without an extended 'green' area the village atmosphere will be lost.
- Efforts should be made to conserve protected and BAP priority species, or offset losses where their displacement cannot be averted.
- A programme of works by the waste water service provider could be set out in the IDP in support of the Local Plan. The IDP is not clear on the distinction between the necessary infrastructure to cover waste water to the existing network and the cost of upgrading the Treatment Works itself.
- The concept plans in the Vision Strategy which relate to land controlled by Bloor Homes has illustrated a land area for up to a 2FE, this is in excess of the 1FE indicated in the IDP to be delivered at the Strategic Site at Tangmere.
- Map 12.8 does not show the brown field sites, the business park and the full extent of the existing glasshouses, the Green Waste site or the Solar Farm. The current level of development is seriously understated as is the role of the brownfield sites.
- The boundary of the strategic site should be amended to include land for improved access to the A27, to follow the field boundary in the SW corner and exclude land to the north east which has existing development (map included).

Implications

Although there are different views on the amount of housing which should be accommodated at Tangmere, there is land available within the area identified for Strategic Development for further development. If additional housing numbers are required Tangmere may be considered as an option for further expansion.

Consideration should also be given to the how the housing numbers should be reflected, sites already with planning permission contribute to the housing delivery, these means Tangmere is delivering over the 1000 homes identified on the strategic site. There is a need to clarify how this is dealt with for example some are requesting this comes off the 1,000 homes identified at the strategic site, an alternative solution

could be to have an additional parish housing number. Work will need to be undertaken to clarify the position.

It is not intended to amend the Plan in relation to the Tangmere WwTW upgrade, detailed joint working has been undertaken with the Council, EA, Natural England and Southern Water to ensure the proposed growth scheme at Tangmere is deliverable. This is the option that was taken forward from the Strategic Growth Study – Wastewater Treatment Options.

Many of the issues raised relate to infrastructure, green space, facilities etc these will be dealt with through masterplanning and/or the neighbourhood plan.

Comments have been received relating to the IDP, as it is a live document, more information will be included as it is received. Southern Water will be providing more information with regard to wastewater infrastructure requirements in due course, and this will be reflected in future versions of the IDP.

Map 12.8: It is not intended to include the triangle of land in the southwest corner as the line currently follows the Parish boundary rather than the field boundary any amendment to the boundary into Oving Parish may complicate the neighbourhood plan process.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: high (further work is required to clarify how existing planning permissions contribute towards the housing numbers in Tangmere)

Suggested Amendments/Modifications

Amend criterion 6 to read “Subject to detailed transport assessment, provide primary road access to the site from the slip-road roundabout at the A27/A285 junction to the west of Tangmere providing a link with Tangmere Road...”

Further work on the strategic area identified on Map 12.8 to be undertaken. Further work is required to clarify the objectives of the policy taking into account the above and following suggestions:

- Additional text to Policy 18 inserted prior to “Development will be master planned...” to read *In recognition of the proposed District wide housing supply falling below the objectively assessed needs (Policy 4), the Council may explore opportunities to increase the capacity of the Strategic Site, should this be feasible and sustainable.*
- Amend Policy to identify specific sustainable transport solutions that will enable Tangmere to support the status of Settlement Hub
- Amend Policy to provide fuller detail of the Infrastructure that will be provided to address the shortfall that is recognised in over sections of the Plan.

Policy 19 Tangmere Strategic Employment Land and Map 12.9

Who made comments

Maddox & Associates on behalf of SE Coast Ambulance Services NHS Foundation Trust (SECamb)
Tangmere Parish Council

Summary of issues:

- The Policy is unduly restrictive in that it limits the provision of jobs to those within B1-B8 use classes. There is a need in the Employment Land Review to address the quality and range of jobs.
- The NPPF makes reference that Local Plans should “*allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land;*”
- Map 12.9 showing the strategic employment land at Tangmere does not accord with map 21.7 which also shows the same land as Horticultural Development Land

Implications

Policy wording to be amended to reflect the objectives of the NPPF and to be consistent with Policy 26 of the Local Plan. Map 21.7 will be updated as the Policy Map.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments/modifications

The Policy is amended to read “4.5 hectares of employment land is allocated for B1-B8 and employment generating sui generis uses in the form of an extension to the Chichester Business Park...”

Policy 20 Southbourne Strategic Development

Who made comments

Mr S Jupp
Carter Jonas (Church Commissioners for England)
Tangmere Parish Council
Neame Sutton Ltd (Crayfern Homes Ltd)
Barton Willmore (Hallam Land Management)

Summary of main issues

- Question the figure of 300 homes allocated to Southbourne; suggest a larger figure with a specific provision for commercial floorspace. Potential for the neighbourhood plan to proceed at a faster pace than the local plan and an allowance should be made to provide further housing if the need arises.
- Welcome the removal of employment land viability; consider that this policy is now sound.
- There is adequate infrastructure for Southbourne to accommodate more than 300 houses and potential for funding failure to improve infrastructure at other strategic sites. Allocating the number at Tangmere to Southbourne would put

less pressure on the Chichester A27 junctions and allow housing to be provided where infrastructure already exists.

- Reword the policy to provide greater clarity enabling the Parish Council and local community to determine the most appropriate locations to accommodate the 300 dwelling requirement through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Amend the policy to read “*Be planned as an extension or extensions to Southbourne that are well integrated with the village and provide good access to existing facilities*”.
- Consider the policy should be amended so that it does not rely on the Neighbourhood Plan to identify all the development proposed at the settlement. The target figure of 300 homes should be increased.

Implications

Prior to submission of the Local Plan, it will be necessary to revisit evidence to ensure that our arguments for parish housing numbers remain valid.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: likely

Impact Rating: severe

Urgency of action: immediate

Suggested amendments /modifications

None, although it may be necessary to revisit evidence to ensure that our arguments for parish housing numbers remain valid.

Policy 22 Integrated Coastal Zone Management for the Manhood Peninsula

Who made comments

Mr David Ackerman

Summary of Main Issues

Comments raising issues of soundness

- Para 13.1 - Not enough is made of the tourism opportunities, and potential benefits for Selsey, from the Medmerry Realignment and Pagham Harbour. Should aim to provide a link road between the two with suitable parking facilities. It should be promoted accordingly.

Implications for Plan

None, as the ICZM Plan provides a broad framework within which more detailed proposals (such as those suggested) can be implemented.

Risks to Plan

Probability rating: very unlikely

Impact rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested Amendments/modifications

No amendments to the policy

Policy 23 Selsey Strategic Development

Who made comments

Stephen Jupp

Summary of main issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

- Employment provision should run in tandem with strategic housing allocations, therefore additional employment floorspace should be included within this policy.

Implications for Plan

Paragraph 13.9 indicates that additional local employment opportunities should be planned in conjunction with new housing development and refers to undeveloped land at Ellis Square. This is the remainder of a site allocated for business, industry and warehousing development in the Chichester District Local Plan 1999 (now shown on Map 21.5 of the Pre-submission Local Plan). The Employment Land Review 2013 recommended reducing the existing employment allocation and allowing a greater range of uses on the site.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: fairly likely
Impact Rating: marginal
Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken. Very minor adjustment to Map 21.5

Policy 24 East Wittering and Bracklesham Strategic Development**Who made comments:**

Mr G Breeze
Genesis Town Planning (Wates Development)
Mr S Jupp
Henry Adams Planning Ltd (G Gentle and Sons)
Elizabeth Lawrence

Summary of main issues

- East Wittering and Bracklesham is constrained to the south by the sea, west by the important gap to West Wittering, east by the FAD policy and north as development would be outside the settlement area. There is a requirement for a secondary school; previous development has had an impact on the character of the area to the detriment of its residents; where is employment provision being located.
- The policy should be amended to refer to a new strategic housing allocation of up to 220 dwellings.
- The employment provision element is too vague, an assessment should be made of the amount of commercial floorspace to be provided and this should be set out in the policy.
- The target figure of 100 homes is significantly low and unrealistic in providing sufficient housing for natural growth and is over reliant on Chichester strategic allocations. East Wittering lacks a secondary school, leisure centre and local employment opportunities; this highlights the need to make the Peninsula sustainable.
- The policy is vague and does not address the economic needs of East and West Wittering. The policy should be based on identified needs and aspirations.

Implications

Prior to submission of the Local Plan, it may be necessary to revisit evidence to ensure that our arguments for parish housing numbers remain valid.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: highly likely
Impact Rating: severe
Urgency of action: immediate

Suggested amendments /modifications

None although it may be necessary to revisit evidence to ensure that our arguments for parish housing numbers remain valid.

Policy 25 North of the Plan Area

Who made comments

Dr Jill Sutcliffe
Surrey County Council
South Downs Society

Summary of main issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

- Requests that the development sites required to meet housing need are identified in the local plan so that infrastructure provision can be planned where it is required, including where cross-boundary provision needs to be provided by Surrey. Add: "*Where new development generates cross county-boundary impacts on transport, education and other strategic infrastructure, appropriate cross boundary mitigation measures will be resourced to maintain and improve the existing provision.*" This would include all modes of transport and all levels of education. (Surrey County Council)

Other representations

- Supporting text should include reference to the important landscape, to the EU sites and to the importance of the Green Infrastructure. What about the buffer zone for this area and its designated sites? The document needs to include reference to the Mens and Ebernoe Nature Reserves Management Plans. (Dr Jill Sutcliffe)

Representations of support

- Support the commitment to conserving the rural character of the area and the intention to meet only locally generated housing needs. (South Downs Society)

Implications for Plan

The Local Plan approach enables local communities to identify parish sites for development through neighbourhood plans and their early preparation has been encouraged. In the North of the Plan Area the Kirdford and Loxwood NPs are at an advanced stage of preparation. An amendment is suggested to the Plan supporting text – see comments on Policy 9.

Amendment suggested to paragraph 14.2

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

Amend paragraph 14.2 to read: *predominantly rural with few sizeable settlements, characterised by undulating landscape with a high proportion of woodland, typical of the Weald. Conserving the rural character of the area, with its high quality landscape and environment is a key objective.*

Policy 26 Existing Employment Sites

Who made comments

Ms S Jupp
Elizabeth Lawrence

Summary of main issues

- Amendments suggested. The policy should be more positively worded to allow redevelopment with new modern premises. The reference to not 'well located' and 'commercially attractive' is confusing.
- The policy and supporting text is vague and not in accordance with the spirit and content of the NPPF. The policy includes sites which are not allocated for employment use. Paragraph 51 of the NPPF states that planning applications for the change of use of commercial buildings to residential should normally be approved where there is an identified need for housing in that area provided there are no strong economic reasons why the development would be inappropriate. The tests which are necessary to demonstrate that a site is no longer reasonably required for employment uses should be clearly stated in the supporting text.

Implications

Further work needs to be undertaken to clarify the intent of the policy.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely
Impact Rating: marginal
Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken to clarify the intent of the policy.

Policy 27 Chichester Centre Retail Policy and paragraph 16.8

Who made comments

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Para 16.8 should be more balanced by recognising that the historic character of the city is part of the high quality experience.
- Para 16.8 should read “However, the historic character of the city centre could also mean that potential future retail development may be constrained”.
- Criteria 4 should read “and which respects any historic character of the building and its setting and incorporates any existing historical or architectural features of merit”.

Implications

None

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Policy 28 Edge and Out of Centre Sites - Chichester**Who made comments**

Havant Borough Council

Brookhouse (Chichester Ltd)

The Prudential Assurance Company

Summary of main issues

- There does not appear to be a policy recognising town centres as the heart of communities and defining a network and hierarchy of centres in line with NPPF (Havant BC)
- Concern that the policy will allow edge and out of centre retail development which may have an adverse impact on the viability of Chichester District and Havant Borough (Havant BC)
- Reference is made to a Small Sites Allocations Document, further information is needed on when this will be produced and period it will cover. It will be interesting to know how this would work along with the preparation of neighbourhood plans. (Havant BC)
- Each application should be judged on its own merits, and applying a definitive restriction on unit sizes does not acknowledge that proposals which fall below a threshold of 1000 sq.m may be suitable in edge and out of centre locations as they meet the requirements of the sequential test. Not aware of the evidence base that has been used to conclude that the threshold of 1000 sq.m is appropriate.
- Criterion 1 is not consistent with the NPPF and should be amended. (Brookhouse (Chichester Ltd), The Prudential Assurance Company)
- Criterion 4 is not consistent para 24 of the NPPF and should be amended to make reference to requiring a sequential assessment if that is what is intended.

Implications

Consultants are preparing a retail assessment of the size and availability of retail units on behalf of the Council as part of an application on Barnfield Drive, this will be publically available as background evidence. Work may need to be undertaken on how the policy sits with the NPPF and amended wording.

Revisit the policy to ensure it is in line with the NPPF. It is not proposed to change the policy further as the timetable for the Small Site Allocations Documents is set out in the LDS, and how the Plan works with the neighbourhood plan process is set out in para 7.31 of the Local Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required to clarify the objectives of the policy taking into account the above and following suggestions:

- The policy could be strengthened by including a criterion that specifies that this development should be within the Chichester Settlement Policy Boundary. This is stated in para 16.14, however it should be included in the policy to make it clear it is a material consideration.
- Request criterion 5 is removed as planning conditions can provide an effective mechanism for controlling minimum unit sizes.
- Criteria 1 - Request a minor amendment to better reflect the NPPF. "The proposal does not have a significant adverse ~~adversely affect on~~ the vitality and viability of the central shopping area, either as an individual development or cumulatively with similar existing or proposed development"

Policy 29 Settlement Hubs and Village Centres Policy

Who made comments

Musgrave Retail Partners GB

Summary of main issues

Representations raising issues of soundness

- Should be consistent with Policy 2 in requiring all new retail development to be of an "appropriate scale". The NPPF requires all edge and out-of-centre retail developments to be assessed against a sequential approach and specifically retail impact and adopts a threshold for retail impact assessments of schemes over 2,500 square metres gross. In view of the size and role of centres such as Selsey Policy 29 should include a local threshold of 300 square metres above which retail assessments will be required. New food stores of 300 square metres or more will perform more than a local convenience role and could compete directly with the town centre.
- In the first part of Policy 29 after "Selsey" insert "*are of an appropriate scale and*" Insert at the end of the 2nd sentence "*subject to a retail assessment showing that the proposed development will not have any significant adverse impact on the town centre in question. Retail assessments will be required for all retail developments proposing over 300 square metres gross floorspace outside the defined town centres*"

Implications for Plan

Further work is required to consider whether to define a centre.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal
Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required to reflect the objectives of the NPPF in this the policy and taking into account the above and following suggestions:

Amend Policy 29 to read: “...*the vitality and viability of the retail centres of East Wittering and Selsey, are of an appropriate scale and conform to the shopping function of the centre.*“

Policy 30 Built Tourist and Leisure Development

Who made comments

Park Holidays UK
English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Criterion 3 uses the term ‘High Quality’ which is undefined and subjective. Development proposals which improve or maintain quality must be supported across the whole range of tourism development and not just in one small specialised sector. This is not supported by the NPPF or in the Isle of Wight Core Strategy hearings 2011. Requested that criterion 3 is omitted (Park Holidays UK)
- Suggest that ‘natural and historic’ is inserted before ‘character’ (English Heritage)

Implications

The protection of the historic environment is covered in other policies within the Local Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely
Impact Rating: marginal
Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required in relation to the use of the term “high quality”.

Policy 31 Caravan and Camping Sites

Who made comments

Mr S Jupp
Park Holidays UK

Summary of main issues

- Wording between policies 30 and 31 is significantly different in policy 31 without any justification. The Policy has been fundamentally altered since the draft plan, there is a query why reference is made to Article 4 Directions.

- It is not clear why policy 30 has the proviso that permission will be granted if all the criteria have been “considered” whereas policy 31 refers to criteria have to be “met”. Mitigation measures may apply to both cases. The Policy as worded is not within the spirit of the NPPF
- Amend or delete para 16.32, as worded it is confusing as to its intention. Appendix 5 relates to the requirements for additional information relating to proposals for the loss of, (inter alia tourism and/or leisure) development to other uses. If it is intended to require evidence in support of applications for wholly new caravan and camping sites this should be clarified.
- Criterion 1 should be deleted as it imposes restraint on reasonable business development; other forms of rural business are not constrained in the same manner.
- Reference to holiday occupancy conditions 12 month holiday park occupancy is being allowed with EA approval of Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans.
- The Council produces no evidence on which to base the presumption in favour of retaining touring caravan pitches over other forms of holiday park accommodation.
- There should be an allowance for summer storage of touring caravans, whilst storage sites are used more intensively in the winter months they are still used during the summer. Request reference to winter storage is deleted
- The last part of the policy relates to storage on existing sites, there are instances of caravan storage elsewhere and an allowance should be made to enable permission to be granted for the storage of touring caravans to be undertaken not just on existing caravan sites

Implications

A number of points have been raised and further work on the policy with possible modifications will need to take place.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work is required to clarify the objectives of the policy taking into account the above.

Policy 32 Horticultural Development Areas

Who made comments

Mr J Zwinkels

Portsmouth Water

West Sussex Growers Association

Madestein UK Ltd (Mr J Zwinkels)

National Farmers Union

Douglas Briggs Partnership (Madestien UK Ltd - Mr P Zwinkels)

Carter Jonas (Church Commissioners for England)

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

Mr P Sansby

Douglas Briggs Partnership (Hall Hunter Partnership)

Summary of main issues

- Paragraph 16.33 is to be praised although the policy is contrary to the NPPF “presumption in favour of sustainable development”. It is overburdened by adding more restrictions to HDA’s and forcing more uses into these areas, where there is limited available and economically sustainable land. It provides further restrictions to development, rather than supporting the development of the second largest industry in the District. Policy criteria are very ambiguous and negative so as to inhibit the progression of the industry. It limits the development of the horticultural production companies and risks associated and valuable supporting industry and infrastructure.
- The policy does not ensure that there will be an adequate, or sustainable, supply of water to horticultural developments. Water efficiency measures will be important but they will not create a new supply. No reference is made to the water resources planning process or to Portsmouth Water. No reference to impacts on Pagham Harbour from possible abstraction and surface water discharges. No reference to the Water Framework Directive and the impact of additional abstraction. Reference should be made to groundwater pollution and the need to protect public water supply aquifers. Source protection zones should be mentioned.
- Grateful for the promise of support from the Council in using Compulsory Purchase Orders. The policy needs redrafting with recommendations and amendments provided. To make the allocation work, unbiased, independent and regular assessments and evaluations are needed, planning policy can then be developed, founded on sound evidence that addresses the issues raised and reflect the true needs of the industry.
- The NFU would like to see a supportive policy for commercial horticulture that abolishes the HDA principle and deals with each planning application on its own merits, within existing planning guidance. NPPF paragraphs 160-161; the draft local plan has not considered a sufficiently robust evidence base in continuing to rely upon HDA designations. Consequently the plan fails to support "the needs of the food production industry" by acting as barrier to further investment in this sector.
- Objected to the designation of a Horticultural Development Area (HDA) on our client's land at Tangmere. Consider the policy unsound and request its deletion. It does not reflect the evidence base or need for this type of development. There has been no significant development over the past ten years or proposals to expand it. There is a risk that the designation will be seen as restricting the future expansion of the village. Any reference to areas for expansion should only relate to the existing uses.
- Welcome the clarity expressed in the Policy concerning horticultural development and the associated criteria.
- The Tangmere HDA needs to be modified to allow for the brownfield housing allocations with a buffer between the housing and the proposed glasshouses and maps 21.7 and 12.8 to be modified. Support paragraph 16.38 setting compulsory purchase powers.
- If differing horticultural development types are included in allocated land, separate designated zones for each type (pack house; glasshouse; polytunnels etc) may be considered to overcome the problems of land value.

Sufficient land (significantly more than at present) would need to be allocated to meet the industry's needs, taking account of the viability and deliverability of sites within allocations.

Implications

An HRA would be undertaken through the abstraction licence application with the Environment Agency.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: immediate

Suggested amendments/modifications

Further work is required to set out the Council's approach to the horticultural industry, monitoring the land currently available and commission an assessment of the future land requirement of the industry, taking into account the comments received.

Policy 33 New Development

Who made comments

English Heritage

Bloor Homes Southern

Commercial Estates Group

Summary of main issues

- Policy is sound, but would prefer an additional criterion: "the proposal would conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment and any particular features of biodiversity or historic merit" in Policy 33 or at least the addition of "natural and historic" before "character" in criterion 6. (English Heritage)
- Criterion 3 should be amended to encourage, but not require connection to the broadband network, as this may not always be possible. (Bloor Homes Southern)
- Support for the thrust of the policy, specifically criterion 5 identifying appropriate density and type of development. (Commercial Estates Group)

Implications

No implications for plan soundness.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

No amendments to the Local Plan.

Policy 34 Affordable Housing

Who made comments

Mr S Jupp
Mr N Richardson
PMB Holdings Ltd
Paula Chatfield

Summary of main issues

- There should be a threshold of 5 units, below which the requirement to provide affordable housing does not apply.
- Site viability factors do not appear to be given proper weighting and the threshold for application of the policy and the appropriate proportion (30%) of such housing in a scheme do not seem to be properly justified notwithstanding the Viability Study.
- To ensure the delivery of small 'windfall' sites we advise that the current affordable housing requirement, outlined in the Interim Statement on planning for Affordable Housing is retained which seeks affordable housing contributions on all but the smallest sites (less than 5 dwellings).
- In the West of Chichester Strategic Development Location, if allocated, the development should respect the existing tenure mix of its nearest neighbour. Currently Parklands families in social housing who need additional space have to move out of the area (e.g. Tangmere, Barnham, and Fishbourne) disrupting existing social ties and community engagement.

Implications

The Viability Study sets out the justification for the 30% affordable housing requirement. A commuted sum will be accepted on sites with a net increase of 5 dwellings or less. No implications for plan soundness.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy

Policy 35 Affordable Housing Exception Sites

Who made comments

English Heritage
Mr P Loveridge
Mr N Richardson

Summary of main issues

- Consider criterion 1 should also include the caveat "and not harm its natural or historic character", also welcome an additional criterion "the development would have no adverse effect on the historic environment or heritage assets".

- Concern about oversubscription at Westgate Leisure Centre classes. The limited ratio of facilities versus demand when a competition runs means regular classes are cancelled (e.g. Karate on Saturdays). Potential expansion through development on existing car park requiring substantial investment and loss of parking spaces The Centre provides a good service but suggested major increase in residents in both Chichester and the surrounding areas it seems likely that the service per resident will decrease.
- Although it makes mention of the option set out in NPPF, the policy introduces a more restrictive regime. Redraft Local Plan in line with comments.

Implications

There is support from English Heritage to this policy and the Heritage policy covers this point. The policy is in line with the aspirations of the NPPF.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy, as heritage is covered by our heritage policy and is in line with the NPPF.

Policy 36 Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling Showpeople

Who made comments

Mr Robert Tutton

English Heritage (Mr Martin Small)

Summary of main issues

- The policy should be as clear and unambiguous as possible. Vague criteria like 'well related to existing settlements' and 'reasonable level of visual and acoustic privacy' are of little assistance, as they fail to provide a clear, objective basis for decisions.
- Conflicts between travellers and the settled population are more likely to occur within small groups of dwellings or in marginal locations on the fringe of urban areas. In order to realistically meet the needs of travellers, CDC should be prepared to permit traveller pitches in locations which may not meet the same sustainability tests as traditional housing.
- The exclusion of local designations (e.g. Strategic Gap) is welcome.
- In order to be clear '*dominate*' and how the '*nearest settled community*' is defined, should be defined. Criterion (6) should suggest relative proportions, distances and scales – would the nearest settled community comprise one house, a housing group, a hamlet, a village etc.?
- Criterion 4 "areas of historical protection" is too limited – the policy should refer to historic features as well as areas and non-designated heritage assets.

Implications

No implications to the soundness of the Plan, however the policy wording will be revisited in light of comments received.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely
Impact Rating: marginal
Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

The policy wording will be revisited in light of comments above except heritage as this is covered elsewhere in the Plan.

Policy 38 Local and Community Facilities**Who made comments**

Paul Neary
The Theatres Trust

Summary of main issues

- Requests that allotments are added to the list of local services and community facilities in paragraph 17.40.
- 5th bullet point in para.1.5 states that local cultural and heritage facilities should be protected and enhanced. The word 'protect' has not been used (for consistency) in Policies 3 and 10

Implications for Plan

Allotments are included in the definition of open space – see Policy 54.

Paragraph 17.41 refers to seeking the retention and protection of local and community facilities. Policy 38 covers the circumstances where development leading to the loss of a community facility will be permitted.

Risk to Plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

No amendments to policy.

Policy 39 Transport, Accessibility and Parking**Who made comments**

Manhood Wildlife & Heritage Group
Mr P Loveridge
West Sussex County Council

Summary of main issues

- Support for the policy; suggest the Evidence base needs to include reference to the WSCC transport plan and that being drawn up by the SDNP.
- The word "severe" should be changed to at most "significant". Provide a plain English measurable definition of the terms "severe/significant" which will not

be open to interpretation by either planning officers, members of the public or developers.

- Please amend 'Travel Assessment' to 'Transport Assessment'. The requirement for this is set out in County Council guidance.

Implications

The NPPF uses the terminology "severe" without providing a definition. Each application is assessed on its own merits and this is for the case officer to decide. No implications to plan soundness.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

Amend 'Travel Assessment' to 'Transport Assessment'. Include WSCC Transport Plan in the evidence base for the policy.

Policy 40 Carbon Reduction

Who made comments

English Heritage

Portsmouth Water

Mr S Jupp

White Young Green (The Sunley Group)

South Downs Society

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd)

The Prudential Assurance Company Limited

Nexus Planning (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of main issues

- Supports the policy as the historic and built environment will be protected and enhanced and development sensitively designed to maintain the local character and identity of the area.
- This policy is not consistent with Policy 12. The national minimum standard will be set within building regulations. There are viability and carbon use concerns about rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling (EA Report SC090018) and building regulations are unlikely to be set at a higher level.
- Ensure this policy is compliant with building regulation requirements or require compliance with building regulation rather than seek more onerous requirements, many of which may not be feasible or appropriate.
- Contrary to paragraph 95 of the NPPF which requires Councils to adopt nationally described standards. The Council need to be mindful of the review of sustainability standards and policies need to be sufficiently flexible to reflect this. The phrase "which ever are higher" within these policies (and the supporting text) is completely inappropriate. Point 3 of the policy; consider it inappropriate for a voluntary assessment code to be introduced as a statutory requirement for new development. Remove the phrase "which ever are higher" and add a caveat to refer to the government's current review of

sustainability standards and how this would impact upon the implementation of the Council's proposed policies.

- Support the approach of promoting more sustainable patterns of development. Policy refers to new buildings: more specific wording to cover the implications of solar panels in sensitive locations such as listed buildings or conservation areas.
- Consider the phrase "which ever are higher" completely inappropriate. Point 3 of the policy, it is inappropriate for a voluntary assessment code to be introduced as a statutory requirement for new development.
- Delete point 4 of the policy as it is not consistent with paragraph 95 of the NPPF "when setting a local requirement, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards". At present there is no national standard for homes or commercial development.
- Consider the requirement in criterion 2 to achieve a minimum of Code Level 4 from 2013, and Level 5 from 2016, are unacceptable and unreasonable and linked specifically to the Code for Sustainable Homes, which is contrary to the direction of travel in terms of national policy. Amend Policy 40 criterion 2 to state: "new development includes a sustainability strategy setting out how developers propose to deal with sustainable construction including, as appropriate, the Code for Sustainable Homes."

Implications

Policy 12 relates to Apuldram specifically addressing the issues of infiltration and increases in network flow. Policy 40 acknowledges that the level should be CfSH or equivalent replacement national minimum standard, which will address changes in Government standards. No amendment to policy, Chichester District Council planning guidance deals with this issue.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Amend title of Policy 40 to "Environmental Sustainability". No amendment to policy with regard to CfSH levels.

Policy 41 Off-site Renewable Energy

Who made comments

English Heritage

South Downs Society

Summary of main issues

- Welcomes and supports criterion 1.
- Welcome the overall approach of supporting renewable energy and welcome the specific mention of potential impact on the national park.

Implications

None

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Policy 42 Flood Risk

Who made comments

Mr D Kent

Birdham and Earnley Flood Prevention Group

English Heritage

Mr N Richardson

West Sussex County Council

Ms P Chatfield

Summary of main issues

- There are areas west of Chichester which may not be in the flood area but are prone to serious flooding; housing developments in these areas should require independently investigated drainage options involving all residents within 500 metres.
- The risk from surface water flooding has not been taken into account in reaching planning decisions. The policy should reflect this risk more clearly.
- Overall support, but would prefer “natural and historic” to be inserted before “character” in the 3rd criteria.
- Do the full requirements of this policy apply to proposals involving conversion /redevelopment of existing buildings or PDL?
- Need to check that the most up to date information has been used in its assessments as the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is from 2008, this is especially true of surface water flooding which has undergone more recent assessments.
- This policy is particularly relevant to West of Chichester SDL. Suggest that responsibility and funding for (ie delivery of) future maintenance of site drainage/flood defence measures is considered in assessing their long-term effectiveness.

Implications

This policy is based on the Environment Agency Flood Maps. The SFRA will be updated taking into account the Medmerry Alignment post 2015. Surface water flooding is a growing concern for parts of the district and work will need to be undertaken to address this in the Local Plan.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken with regard to surface water flooding

Policy 43 Chichester Harbour AONB

Who made comments:

Christopher Mead-Briggs
Chichester Harbour Conservancy
The Itchenor Society
English Heritage
West Itchenor Parish Council
Kieron Gregson (Carter Jonas LLP)
SDNPA

Summary of main issues

- The policy should require all the criteria (including 5) to be met. Existing wording is insufficient to protect the Harbour and the AONB.
- Welcomes and supports the requirements of the policy. Although not sufficient a concern for English Heritage welcome "cultural heritage" being inserted between "natural beauty" and "and locally distinctive..." in criterion 1.
- Suggest criteria 1 is reworded to "... are conserved and **where possible** enhanced. More emphasis placed on the opportunity to redevelop derelict and damaged sites/buildings.
- The criteria used relate to matters akin to the second purpose and duty of National Parks, neither of which need to apply in AONBs. This may be therefore in conflict with national policy.

Implications

The Chichester Harbour AONB has limited weight in the planning process and has not been through the same statutory process of a development plan document therefore the requirements need to have been considered. There is no conflict with the NPPF.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely
Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Policy 44 Development around the Coast

Who made comments

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Welcomes and supports the reference to design and the historic environment.

Implications

None

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Policy 45 Development in the Countryside**Who made comments**

Gregory Gray Associates (The Garden Centre Group)

English Heritage

Carter Jonas (Church Commissioners for England)

RUPC Ltd (Park Holiday UK)

Barton Willmore (Hallam Land Management Ltd)

Summary of main issues

- Need to make reference to potential development of brownfield sites in the countryside which do not necessarily require a countryside location or meet an essential small scale or local need. Policy is contrary to the NPPF in strictly controlling retail development with providing any criteria to do so.
- Overall support but would welcome a caveat that the proposal should not detract from the historical significance of a farmstead.

Implications

Further work needs to be undertaken on this policy particularly consideration of the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the rural area and the NPPF/permitted development rights.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: High

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken on this policy in light of the comments above relating to brownfield sites.

Policy 46 Alterations, Change of Use and/or Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Countryside Sites**Who made comments**

English Heritage

Ms S Jupp

Carter Jonas (Church Commissioners for England)

Elizabeth Lawrence

Mr N Richardson

Summary of main issues

- Support for criterion 6 of the policy.
- The policy is contrary to the objectives of the NPPF.

Implications

Following the changes to permitted development rights, further work needs to be undertaken.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work needs to be undertaken with regard to this policy.

Policy 47 Heritage

Who made comments

English Heritage

Terence O'Rourke (Goodwood Estate Company Limited)

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Ms P Chatfield

Summary of main issues

- To avoid misinterpretation at the development management stage, consider that criterion 4 should be clarified to ensure that it cannot be viewed as conflicting with the Council's proposals under Policy 17.
- Landscape Study referred to in 19.46, identifies West of Chichester SDL as predominantly late post medieval in character. West of Chichester SDL allocation should be designated a natural heritage asset.
- Paragraph 19.34 should be more specific with the numbers of different assets and Identify if any assets are at risk
- Paragraph 19.46 should be more specific about the proactive actions that it might undertake
- Policy fails to satisfy the requirement to deliver conservation and enhancement of the Historic environment. There is a lack of reference to heritage assets at risk. Considering the use of Article 4 Directions, compiling or a local list, assessing Grade II Buildings at Risk, then English Heritage would consider Policy 47 to be an adequate Strategic Policy
- Strategic Policy needs to be supported by more detailed development management policy or policies setting out how development affecting heritage assets will be assessed.
- Plan does not identify any land where development would be inappropriate because of historic significance.

Implications

Revisit the policy and supporting to in line with the comments received.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: marginal

Urgency of action: medium

Suggested amendments /modifications

Further work will be undertaken following the comments above.

Policy 48 Natural Environment**Who made comments**

Mr S Jupp

White Young Green (The Sunley Group)

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd)

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

Paula Chatfield

Summary of main issues

- Criteria 4 is a reinstatement of strategic gaps which no longer exist. Delete all words after “maintained”.
- Duplication of Policy 2 regarding coalescence and do not consider the phrase “no adverse impact” to be consistent with the NPPF.
- To avoid misinterpretation criteria 4 should be clarified to ensure that it cannot be viewed as conflicting with proposals in Policy 17.
- Support the policy but feel it is undermined by Policy 15.

Implications

The policy tries to maintain the individual identity of settlements by avoiding coalescence but is not re-instating strategic gaps. Do not consider the policy is contrary to the objectives of the NPPF. There is potential to reword criteria 4.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Change the word “diminished” in criteria 4.

Policy 49 Biodiversity**Who made comments**

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic)

White Young Green (Sunley Group)

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

Summary of main issues

- Criteria 2 needs to be re-worded as in its current form it requires developments to avoid and mitigate impacts on biodiversity.

- Add reference to CDC Local Biodiversity Action Plan and species and habitats listed on the NERC S41. This also needs to be added to the evidence base and Annex.

Implications

Agree with changes proposed for Criteria 2. NERCS41 and the Local Biodiversity Action Plan would be evidence used when applying for planning permission.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Re-word criteria 2 to “avoided ~~and~~ or mitigated”. No amendment with regard to NERCS41 and Local Biodiversity Action Plan

Policy 50 Disturbance Chichester and Langstone

Who made comments

Natural England

Mr S Jupp

Manhood Wildlife and Heritage Group

Kieron Gregson (Carter Jonas LLP)

White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic Ltd)

RSPB

Nexus Planning (Commercial Estate Group)

Summary of main issues

- Policy appears to suggest that the 5.6km ‘Zone of Influence’ is founded on Natural England’s advice. Overall support for the policy but feel that formal agreement in each case may be unnecessary and bureaucratic.
- “Cumulative” effect for all net increases in dwellings, add ‘cumulative’ before ‘significant effect’ in first paragraph. Question how a one-off financial contribution could be maintained in perpetuity.
- Overall support for the policy but cautious about over-reliance on “mitigation measures” which can be inappropriate and not tested or peer reviewed.
- A threshold for the number of units that would/would not require an appropriate assessment/mitigation is needed as this would create more certainty of when to apply the policy. Mixed use development could have an impact on the SPA and especially the shoreline. Suggest such development should also be included in a threshold that would require appropriate assessment/mitigation.
- Development at any of the sites proposed around the City has the potential to contribute to increased recreational pressure, based on the current evidence base. West of Chichester, above and beyond other options around the City, offers the opportunity to incorporate strategic mitigation. Further opportunities for mitigation are capable of successful implementation through the West of Chichester development proposals.

- Supports the policy and welcome the policy wording following that developed by the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project and the provisions of criteria a) to c)

Implications

Agreement of principles of avoidance at Chichester and Landstone Harbours through SDMP work and meetings with Marian Ashdown regarding Pagham Harbour.

Agreement of joint avoidance package for the Solent will mean not consulting Natural England on each planning application provided the applicants agree to obligations. Involvement with Pagham Harbour will involve Natural England on a case by case basis as development overall is on a smaller scale.

The phrase “either alone or in-combination” will be added to the policy for clarity. The policy applies to all net increases. The Policy is based on evidence through the SDMP and shows recreational disturbance (dog walking, walking etc) as having the significant impacts. There is a requirement for all the Chichester strategic sites to address the issue of recreational disturbance.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add “either alone or in-combination with other developments” after Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA in the first sentence.

Policy 51 Disturbance at Pagham Harbour

Who made comments

Kirsten Lanchester

Mr S Jupp

RSPB

Natural England

Summary of main issues

- 3.5 km "zone of influence" is not supported by the evidence gathered, additional research is needed to determine the extent of the "zone of influence" required by the habitats designation. The zone is also contrary to Arun District Council's policy and therefore fails under the duty to cooperate.
- “Cumulative” effect for all net increases in dwellings, add ‘cumulative’ before 'significant effect' in first paragraph. Question how a one-off financial contribution could be maintained in perpetuity.
- Overall support for the policy. Reference to the LNR Management Plan should be replaced with Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy once produced.
- Overall support for the policy but feel that formal agreement in each case may be unnecessary and bureaucratic

Implications

The 3.5km is based on sound evidence and is reasonable in applying the zone of influence. A meeting held on 10th January 2014 with officers from Arun District Council concluded that a commissioning a further joint study would add further delays and costs to the local plan process and may not change existing evidence.

The phrase “either alone or in-combination” will be added to the policy for clarity.

Agreement of principles of avoidance at Chichester and Landstone Harbours through SDMP work and meetings with Marian Ashdown regarding Pagham Harbour.

Agreement of joint avoidance package for the Solent will mean not consulting Natural England on each planning application provided the applicants agree to obligations. Involvement with Pagham Harbour will involve Natural England on a case by case basis as development overall is on a smaller scale.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: low

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add “either alone or in-combination with other developments” after Pagham Harbour SPA in the first sentence.

Policy 52 Green Infrastructure

Who made comments

Mr S Johnson

English Heritage

Nexus Planning (Commercial Estates Group)

Summary of main issues

- Overall support for the policy, need to show the Green Infrastructure map to show the plan is positively prepared and justified.
- Overall support for the policy, suggest adding additional text referring to the historical environment.
- The policy requires development to “address any deficits in local green infrastructure’. We understand the intention is to support developments which would help to address any deficits in green infrastructure. However as drafted the policy is unreasonable and unlawful as new development cannot be expected to address pre-existing issues.

Implications

The Green infrastructure map is part of the background evidence used to inform the green infrastructure objectives, it will be referenced when completed. Agree that new development should not be expected to address existing deficits/issues.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible
Urgency of action: high

Suggested amendments /modifications

Add the Council's green infrastructure mapping project to the evidence base in Policy 52 and the overall evidence base. Re-word the first sentence in the policy relating to addressing any deficits.

Policy 53 District Canals

Who made comments

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Overall support, however, consider that, as the District's canals are of historic interest, "historical" should be added after "ecological".

Implications

The Heritage Policy (Policy 47) covers this point.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment as this point is covered by the Heritage Policy.

Policy 54 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Who made comments

Don Kent

English Heritage

Summary of main issues

- Existing open space to the west of Thorney Road in Hermitage should be preserved, and new open space created within new developments along the A27 and near railways.
- English Heritage supports the policy.

Implications

No implications

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No changes proposed in light of the comments above. The policy will be re-written to clarify the targets and open space requirements to enable collection of S106/CIL contributions.

Policy 55 Equestrian Development

Who made comments

SDNPA

Summary of main issues

- Reference to equestrian development not having ‘an impact on the special qualities of the landscape, for example National Park, should refer to the setting of the National Park. Add views from the National Park in criteria 3.

Implications

The setting and views of the National Park is covered in Policy 48 Natural Environment.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments /modifications

No amendment to the policy.

Appropriate Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal

Who made comments

Natural England

Madestein UK Ltd (Mr J Zwinkels)

Madestien UK Ltd (Mr P Zwinkels)

Nexus Planning Ltd (Commercial Estates Group)

EDP/White Young Green (Linden Homes and Miller Strategic)

Summary of main issues

- Concern with regard to para 4.5.31 of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and reference to the impact of nitrogen deposition. There is a lack of evidence in the Local Plan of actions, funding or effectiveness of measures proposed to address this impact.
- The sustainability appraisal is defective in a number of ways; it does not describe the options considered or what assumptions were made to deliver the assessment of alternatives; it would not be possible to evaluate some options without the evidence base; it would not be possible to evaluate the effectiveness or impact of expansion of allocated sites without first considering where those expansion sites may be.
- Do not consider that the North East Chichester/Westhampnett SDL has been properly informed by a robust Sustainability Appraisal.
- Disagree that “recreational disturbance issues become more difficult to mitigate at this scale” and our view is supported by the Solent Disturbance

and Mitigation Project which does not identify constraints (either in quantum, location or time periods) to development within the plan period.

- The Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project does not differentiate between sites within 5.6km from Chichester Harbour, therefore the comments within the Sustainability Appraisal regarding location and/ or timescales for delivery at West of Chichester are unsubstantiated. Impacts for any level of development are at worst neutral subject to the implementation of the recommendations of the Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project.
- We do not support the conclusions that development in excess of 1000 units would disrupt the main ecological corridor between the Downs and the Harbour that runs through this site. The potential for habitat creation/ enhancement is recognised by the Sustainability Appraisal - although this fails to recognise that the size of the allocation may reflect the ecological benefits of the overall development.
- There is no evidence to suggest that development north of Old Broyle Road would result in unacceptable (or irreconcilable) impacts on Brandy Hole Copse.
- Evidence should be provided to identify which species, species group and/or species are reliant on these ecological corridors. The impacts are at worst neutral reflecting the low/ local value of wildlife corridors within the site (particularly in respect of Centurion Way).
- There will be additional traffic arising from the development at West of Chichester, but the increases in both total traffic and HGV traffic across the day on the roads around the site and on the A27 for the highest level of development on the site will be lower than the IEMA guidance of when an assessment being needed. No assessment work has been undertaken, the identified scores are not agreed and the severe negative impact for greater than 1,000 houses should just be a minor negative impact.
- Do not support the conclusions reached in Scenario 3 or that development West of Chichester in excess of 1,000 dwellings will result in adverse impacts on views of Chichester which are currently very limited.
- Disagree with impacts on the distinction between Fishbourne and Chichester. The presence and prominence of the A27 provides a physical and visual barrier to the westward extent of Chichester. Subject to the implementation of a landscape corridor to the west of the site (as proposed), there is no basis to claim that the local populace would not have a clear understanding of the difference between these settlements on the ground.
- Given the extremely generous Green Infrastructure provision proposed as part of the development impacts are considered to be at worst minus (-), particularly having regard to enhancing green spaces along the western edge of the development.

Implications

The Local Plan has taken account of the advice given in the HRA by focussing on maximising opportunities for sustainable transport and reducing reliance on private vehicles.

The SA did examine an option for new HDA's at an earlier stage as mentioned within the statement on the difference the process has made. Options that were considered to be undeliverable were not included within the further assessment.

The SA looked at options for 500 homes and for considerably more than 500 homes and informs members in drawing up the Local Plan but does not make the decision for them. Therefore Policy 17 has been informed by a robust SA and but has also been informed by many other planning issues.

The SDMP does not identify constraints in terms of the scale of development but the draft policy wording in the phase three report on which we have based policy 50 which does recognise that larger developments may have a stand-alone affect and require additional avoidance measures.

The SA looks at the level of development on the site not at any specific master plans or development proposals of the site.

The Green Infrastructure is robust, EDP have not provided any counter evidence (to date). The larger the scale of development the larger the potential impacts are on ecological corridors. The SA looks at the level of development on the site not at any specific master plans or development proposals of the site.

The SA indicates that greater levels of development will have a greater impact on Air Quality. The need or otherwise for a detailed assessment as detailed within the IEMA guidance is a matter for the master planning and planning application process. The SA is assessing the strategic issues around the site.

Green Infrastructure provision of EDPs particular proposal may mitigate the potential impact identified within the SA however the SA looks at the impact different scales of development would have on the landscape not at any specific master plans or development proposals of the site.

Any risk to plan

Probability Rating: very unlikely

Impact Rating: negligible

Urgency of action: none

Suggested amendments/modifications

No amendments to the Local Plan