

Chichester Local Plan Examination Hearings	
Tuesday 30th September, 2014	
Matter 1 : Legal and procedural requirements	
1	Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme?
2	Has the plan been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement?
3	Has the Plan had regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy?
4.	Has the Plan been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have all reasonable alternatives been considered? • Has the SA been updated as the Plan has developed to take account of changing circumstances?
5	Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Habitats Directive?
6	Have all the procedural requirements for publicity been met?
7	Has the Council submitted robust evidence to demonstrate that it has met the Duty to Co operate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Council taken all reasonable steps in seeking to meet development needs that cannot be met in the District? • Has the Council taken all reasonable steps in engaging with the South Downs National Park (SDNP) Authority to establish the extent to which meeting development needs can be met in the part of the District which lies within the SDNP?

Tuesday 30th September, 2014	
Matter 2: Vision, Objectives and the Overall Strategy	
1	Do the vision and objectives address the key issues for the area?
2	Does the development strategy provide a robust framework for delivering the Plan's vision and objectives?
3	Has the strategy been positively prepared and will it deliver sustainable development in accordance with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?
4	Is the strategy the most appropriate in the light of all the options and is it clear why other options were dismissed?
5	Is the Plan justified by a robust and credible evidence base?
6	Does the Plan provide an effective monitoring framework, which identifies risks to delivery and provides contingencies/ triggers for action if progress is not made as planned?
7	Does the Plan include flexibility to allow for changing circumstances, particularly with regard to the dependency of development in the SDLs on the provision of key infrastructure such as highway improvements and the upgrade to Tangmere WwTW?
8	Does the Plan set out clearly which parts of the 1999 Chichester District Local Plan it will replace?

Chichester Local Plan Examination Hearings	
Wednesday 1st October, 2014	
Matter 3: Development and Settlement Hierarchy	Policy 2
1	Is the settlement hierarchy based on robust and up to date evidence?
2	Are the settlement boundaries justified by evidence?
3	Do the criteria for development in the service villages allow sufficient flexibility?
4	Should this policy, Policy 5 or Policy 6, carry forward the approach to development outside of settlement policy areas where the boundary is contiguous with the settlement policy area (as set out in the interim policy statement "Facilitating Appropriate Development")
5	Does the policy address the specific character and nature of the area north of the Plan area?

Thursday 2nd October, 2014	
Matter 4: The economy	Policies 11/15/16/19/24/26/28/29/32
Employment land	
1	Is the quantum of employment land set out in Policy 3 informed by and consistent with the most up to date evidence in the Employment Land Review (ELR) update 2012?
2	What is the relationship between the quantum of proposed employment development and the quantum of housing that is planned? Does the quantum of employment land take account of the under- allocation of housing? Does the Plan provide for monitoring and adjusting employment development in relation to housing delivery?
3	Is the Plan internally consistent and does it set out a clear framework for the distribution of employment land (25 ha new employment land across the borough) through Policies 11, 15, 16, 19 (employment land in the east- west corridor) and Policy 24 (employment land on the Manhood Peninsula)?
4	How is the requirement for 5 hectares of B1 office space in Policy 3 and paragraph 12.9 translated into the allocation of 6ha of B1 use in Policy 15?
5	Policy 11 (paragraphs 12.10/12.11) refers to sites with potential for employment use subject to further investigations. Is it clear how these potential sites, to be allocated through the Site Allocations Local Plan or an Area Action Plan, will relate to the quantum of employment land set out in Policy 3?
6	Does the Plan provide clear criteria for employment development in settlement hubs and service villages?
7	Is Policy 26 (existing employment sites) justified, clear and consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF?
Retail	
8	Is Policy 28 (edge and out of centre retail sites: Chichester) consistent with paragraphs 24 – 27 of the NPPF?
9	Is criterion 5 of Policy 28, restricting the floorspace of retail units to 1000m2, justified?
10	Should Policy 29 (Retail policy for in Settlement Hubs and Village Centres) set a floorspace limit for retail development?
Horticultural Development	

11	Does Policy 32 plan positively for adequate and appropriate horticultural development, both within and outside the Horticultural development Areas?
12	Does the Plan provide adequate support for horticulture development and allow for appropriate account to be taken of viability?

Tuesday 7th & Wednesday 8th October, 2014

Matter 5: Housing supply

Policy 4

Objectively Assessed Need

1	Is the evidence that has been used to determine the full, objectively assessed housing need for the district in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF and with the methodology set out in the NPPG? (the evidence is largely to be found in CD17a and CD17b, the Coastal West Sussex Housing Market Assessment Update (SHMA) and SHMA Chichester Summary Report, CD87, the updated demographic projections for Sussex Coast HMA Authorities and CD10, April 2014 Assessment of Housing Development needs Study: Sussex Coast HMA))
2	For clarity, what is the Council's estimation of OAN? (based on the SHMA estimation of an annual need for 438 – 497 homes per year, the requirement of 529 homes per year which flows from CD87 and the range of 530 – 630 which is calculated in CD10?)

Housing provision

3	Can the Council demonstrate that it has taken all reasonable steps, through co-operation with adjacent authorities, to meet housing need that it contends cannot be met in the Plan area?
4	Has the Council taken a rigorous approach to reach an agreement with the SDNPA on the appropriate level of the district's housing need that can be accommodated in the SDNP?
5	What options has the Council considered in seeking to accommodate the OAN? What opportunities/ sites have been considered and dismissed and why have they been dismissed?
6	How has the target of 6973 homes been arrived at as the number that can be provided over the Plan period?
7	Have all opportunities to increase the supply of housing been explored?
8	In the context of the NPPF, but particularly paragraph 47, does the evidence demonstrate that the effects of meeting the OAN would significantly outweigh the benefits?

Identifying a five year supply of specific deliverable sites

9	Does the delivery of an annual average of below 350 completions in the Plan area in the period 2001-12 represent persistent under delivery as referred to in NPPF paragraph 47, leading to a requirement for a 20% buffer when calculating the five year supply?
10	Is the Plan supported by an identified and up to date five year supply of sites?
11	Have all the risks to delivering these sites within the required time frame been explored, including wastewater treatment capacity and reliance on adoption of neighbourhood plans or a DPD (Local Plan)?

Thursday 9th October, 2014	
Matter 6: Other Housing Issues	
Policies 33/34/35/36	
Affordable Housing	
1	Is the percentage and thresholds for contributions justified by viability evidence?
2	Does Policy 34 provide a clear basis for assessing viability of individual proposals?
Affordable Housing Exception Sites	
3	Are the criteria for allowing affordable housing development outside settlement boundaries consistent with the NPPF paragraph 54?
Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	
4	Will the timescale for preparation of the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Document, included in the May 2014 LDS, enable sites to be delivered to the timescales identified in Policy 36?

Tuesday 28th October, 2014	
Matter 7: Strategic Development Locations (SDLs)	
Policies 7/15/16/17/18	
Scale, location and quantum of development	
1	Are the locations and boundaries of the four SDLs justified by robust evidence, taking account of all environmental and infrastructure constraints?
2	Is the scale and mix of development proposed in each of the SDLs (in Policies 15, 16, 17 and 18) based on a rigorous assessment of capacity?
3	Does the evidence demonstrate that the timing and phasing of development in each of the SDLs is viable and deliverable as set out in the housing trajectory?
4	Is the level of detail set out in Policies 15 – 18, together with the masterplanning requirements in Policy 7, sufficient to meet the requirements of the NPPF paragraphs 154 and 157?
5	Do the masterplanning requirements set out a robust framework for taking development forward, including provision for public engagement?
Highways Infrastructure	
5	Are the SDLs supported by detailed and robust evidence of highway infrastructure planning?
6	Does the evidence demonstrate that issues of funding, viability and timing of A27 junction improvements have been satisfactorily addressed?
7	Have risks to delivery been rigorously examined and are contingencies in place to avoid any potential "showstoppers" ?
Wastewater Treatment Facilities	
8	Have constraints to development presented by restrictions in wastewater treatment capacity been addressed in sufficient detail to ensure that development on the SDLs can be delivered?
9	Have risks to delivery been rigorously examined and are contingencies in place to avoid any potential "showstoppers"?

Tuesday 28th October, 2014	
Matter 7A: Parish Housing Sites	Policies 5/6
Parish Housing Sites	
1	Are the indicative numbers for the Parish Housing Sites based on robust and up to date evidence?
2	Are neighbourhood plans or a Site Allocations Plan capable of delivering housing in the parishes in accordance with the housing trajectory
3	Does the Plan provide a clear strategy for managing and monitoring housing development and delivery in the Parishes?
4	What is the justification for the threshold of 6 dwellings for reducing the requirement for additional housing in a Parish?
5	What is the relationship between the FAD (Facilitating Appropriate Development) Study Oct 2012 and the neighbourhood plans? Is there a clear definition/cut off mechanism for recording development brought forward under FAD and that which will be identified in the neighbourhood plans?

Wednesday 29th October, 2014	
Matter 8: Other area specific policies/ strategies – Policies 10/14/20	
Policy 10: Chichester City Development Principles	
1	Does the policy set out a clear strategy for managing development in the City and at the edges of the urban area?
Policy 14: Development at Chichester City North	
2	Is an Area Action Plan the most appropriate vehicle to set out a co-ordinated framework for implementing this policy and to link sites to the north east of the city and the Westhampnett and NE Chichester SDL?
3	At what stage is it appropriate for negotiations regarding the balance of open space/ built development to take place?
Policy 20: Southbourne Strategic Development	
4	Is the requirement for 300 homes justified by the evidence?
5	Does the policy provide sufficient clarity on the potential for a single or several extensions to Southbourne?
6	Does the policy set out a clear approach to employment development, following on from paragraph 12.65?
The Manhood Peninsula	
7	Is the requirement for 100 homes in East Wittering/ Bracklesham justified by the evidence?

Wednesday 29th October, 2014	
Matter 9: The Environment	Policies
40/42/43/45/46/47/48/49/52	
Carbon Reduction Policy	
1	The Government's Housing Standards Review and the Ministerial Statement on the Building Regulations (13 March 2014) make it clear that in future energy standards will be set through national building regulations. In this context is it appropriate to set requirements in Policy 40 for Code for Sustainable Homes levels 4 and 5, together with BREEAM level "very good" mean?
Flood Risk	
2	Does the 2008 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment represent a robust and up to date basis for identifying the SDLs and their boundaries and directing development to the parishes?
3	Should Policy 42 be expanded to include Water management, expand on the requirement for SUDS and include reference to the South East River Basin Management Plan?
Development in the AONB and the Countryside	
4	Policy 43: Are the criteria sufficiently robust to protect the Chichester Harbour AONB? Are references to the Management Plan robust?
5	Policy 45: Is criterion 2 too restrictive?
6	Policy 46: Are the criteria consistent with the NPPF?
Heritage	
7	Policy 47: Heritage - Does policy provide sufficient detail to be consistent with the NPPF and provide appropriate guidance for planning applications?
The natural environment	
8	Policy 48 - Is the policy justified and is criterion 4 consistent with other parts of the Plan where urban extensions are planned?
Biodiversity	
9	Policy 49: Is criterion 2 clear in requiring avoidance and mitigation? SPAs Should a threshold be included for net increase in residential? (carter Jonas)
Green infrastructure	
10	Policy 52: Is the Plan justified and effective in requiring development to address any deficits in local green infrastructure provision?
Appendix 1: Green Infrastructure	
11	Discussion on this appendix should take place if concerns have not been addressed by Statements of Common Ground.

Thursday 30th October, 2014	
Matter 10: Infrastructure	
Policies 8/9/12/ Map 12.3/IDP	
IDP	
1	Is the Plan supported by robust infrastructure Planning?
2	Is the Plan underpinned by project planning to examine the relationship between infrastructure provision and development, particularly in the SDLs and to identify potential "show stoppers"?
Transport	
3	Transport Study (CD18): Are the proposed mitigation measures (A27 junction improvements) assessed against the correct level of housing growth across the Plan period?
4	What questions remain regarding funding and timing of the proposed traffic mitigation measures?
5	Does Map 12.3 show sufficient detail of public transport and cycle routes?
Wastewater Treatment	
6	Policy 12: Is the policy soundly based to reflect the situation at Apuldram WwTW and the position of the Environment Agency?
7	Policy 12: Should criterion 1 refer to water use in litres/head/day rather than the CSH (in order to be future-proofed)