

Chichester Local Plan Review 2034 – Issues and Options Consultation 22 June – 3 August 2017

Results of Consultation – Main Issues Raised (Questions 1 to 10)

Question 1: Are there any cross-boundary planning issues that the Council should consider in preparing the Local Plan Review? Please provide details.

TOTAL: 79 responses

796504; 757796; 375308 (Tangmere PC); 746653; 1104438; 1104755; 753618; 755714; 1103272; 1105257; 1105291; 1105368 (Arun and Chichester District Bridleways Group); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 375142 (Historic England); 375315 (West Itchenor PC); 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates Ltd); 807049 (Surrey CC); 1104753; 1105830; 1105988; 1106023 (Cllr Carol Purnell); 1106172 (Oving PC); 1106178 (Genesis Town Planning obo Cala Homes); 1106336; 1106452 (West Wittering PC); 1106522 (Southern Planning Practice obo D C Heaver & Eurequity IC Ltd); 374954; 375067 (British Horse Society); 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook PC); 375303 (Southbourne PC); 375318 (Wisborough Green PC); 376056 (WSCC); 376799; 396970; 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management); 743931 (SDNPA); 755400 (South Downs Society); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 807049 (Surrey CC); 974389 (Casa Coevo); 1102847; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106005; 1106446; 1106486 (Natural England); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1106566; 1110024; 1110135; 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold PC); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114796 (Gladman); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 756580 (Sigma Planning obo Rydon Homes); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 832429 (Barton Willmore obo Martin Grant Homes); 878413 (Thakeham Homes); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne PC); 1115333; 1115347; 1115654; 1115662

Cross boundary discussions with neighbouring authorities (including Arun, Horsham, SDNPA, Surrey and Hampshire etc.) are essential in terms of potential development and impact on infrastructure. Need to plan positively. Resolution of conflict between other planning authorities over housing numbers.

Cross boundary thinking is essential for spread of sustainable development; small sites; sites that are accessible to train and road network; strategic view needs to be taken of region and travel to work area.

Need a holistic view of infrastructure provision, housing and economic development.

Objectively assessed need (OAN) should be met in full this time; also need to address future needs within the wider housing market area. .

Need to be clear about how much of SDNPA OAN deficit will be taken on by CDC. SDNPA should take fair share of housing, including affordable housing.

Background evidence for infrastructure needs updating and is essential.

Issue of A27/east-west axis and improvements is crucial as it crosses boundaries; links to A259; cycle tracks as links; link road Tangmere to Westergate; expansion of green infrastructure and links into other LPAs.

Co-operation and collaborative work required with key statutory bodies and organisations (eg Natural England, Highways England (for example in relation to air quality), Environment Agency, Chichester Harbour Conservancy); also need to consider the impact of other authorities' Plans.

Recognition needs to be made of parish boundaries and the areas within a parish that are able to provide for its housing numbers.

Policy approach to SDNP should be considered in more detail along with the setting of the SDNP.

Need liaison with cross-boundary authorities in relation to self or custom build.

Improvement to bridleway shortage and linkages.

Question 2: Do you agree with the Vision for the Local Plan area set out above?

TOTAL: 52 responses Yes - 49 No - 3

Question 3: Please suggest any changes that you think should be made to the Vision for the Local Plan Review.

TOTAL: 43 responses

1104438; 746653; 1103272; 1105430 (Fishbourne PC); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 375142 (Historic England); 375315 (West Itchenor PC); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1104753; 1105988; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving PC); 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375277 (Fishbourne PC); 375303 (Southbourne PC); 375318 (Wisborough Green PC); 416457; 743931 (SDNPA);

781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates Ltd); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering PC); 1106522; 1106566; 1114183; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 376056 (WSCC); 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management Ltd); 753541 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 974389 (Casa Coevo); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1106099 (Westbourne PC); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore LLP)

Should plan positively, be aspirational but realistic and deliverable.

Too much focus on numbers rather than strategy; need to put effort into how the Council wants the District to develop; think bigger and bolder; encompass innovative ideas for accommodating future need.

Housing should be priority of Vision; focus on local people particularly young people; provide good quality new homes for everyone, from families and first time buyers to students and older people.

Already too much development in East/West corridor; too much congestion; issues with A27; train links are slow.

Agree approach of considering District in three sections and in principle of protecting the National Park and the AONB. Support in principle the concentration of housebuilding in Chichester and the East-West corridor. Good transport links and infrastructure essential.

Little evidence the substantial housing increase in recent years has achieved any of the vision aims.

Should include reference to need for enabling development to fund infrastructure. Necessary in terms of transport and community facilities, sufficient, comprehensive, development should be permitted in appropriate, sustainable locations.

If there is need for affordable/social housing these should be built where they are required.

Should include the need to protect the individual identities of villages.

SDNP has squeezed Chichester District - SDNP must look at taking a fair share of development.

Chichester is restricted in size by natural boundaries, SDNP, Chichester harbour and the sea.

Development must be concentrated in areas with direct train links and closer to the city which has all the amenities. The vision should look to

any potential for a New Town with infrastructure developed in line with the number of houses.

Lack of recognition of the economic importance of Chichester Harbour AONB in the Vision

Does not include reference to protecting environment and assets including biodiversity, air quality, historic environment etc.; need to recognise importance of rural land and landscape for wellbeing of residents and sustainability of economy (eg food production on best quality land and promotion of tourism). Well-managed natural environment delivers more or better positive benefits; green and blue infrastructure.

Significant uplift in housing provision is required to deliver Vision. Increase housing delivery in sustainable locations within the sub areas, including Southbourne and East Wittering/ Bracklesham. Further development at Tangmere would continue to significantly enhancing the village's range of facilities for the benefit of the local community.

Question 4: Do you agree with the Vision for the three sub-areas? (i.e. East-West Corridor; Manhood Peninsula; North of Plan Area)

TOTAL: 61 responses Yes – 20

1103160; 1104438; 375108; 746653; 753618; 1103272; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1104753; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving PC); 375260 (Bosham PC); 375318 (Wisborough Green PC); 381100; 396970; 805751 (Sunley Estates Ltd); 1105019 (Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1105988; 1106452 (West Wittering PC); 1106486 (Natural England); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1106522; 1110024; 1110054; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Limited); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners for England); 375277 (Fishbourne PC); 375303 (Southbourne PC); 376799; 389541 (Loxwood Society); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 653668 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 806517 (Neame Sutton Ltd obo Crayfern Homes Ltd); 974389 (Casa Coevo); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne PC); 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold PC); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore LLP); 1115333; 1115347; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 1115662

General

Establish number of houses required before agreeing strategy; comprehensive rather than piecemeal development.

Focus on settlement hubs; explore potential to establish one or more sub-areas for growth.

Distribution of housing needs to be revised to take account of the deliverability issues.

Need least constrained most sustainable locations.

Reference should be made to the provision of appropriate and relevant infrastructure.

Opportunities in Manhood or other restricted areas to provide for limited and appropriate developments in response to specific needs and justification.

Maintain separation of City and other adjacent settlements to conserve character and separation from development in Western Arun District.

Growth should not impact negatively on adjacent service villages.

Sub-vision for individual settlements to differentiate between them and allow for appropriate levels of development to be directed to each settlement.

East-West Corridor

Best option.

Vision needs updating to reflect the current position.

A27 overloaded.

Risk of adjacent villages and towns coalescing into each other and/or Chichester; include statement to recognise need to stop coalescence of distinctive settlements.

City will need to expand to accommodate the required housing and associated growth.

Focus on development to existing larger settlements with rail stations, Southbourne, Broadbridge and Fishbourne. Large scale development at S7 and a more southern S8 could help modal shift to public transport and make these settlements more sustainable.

Concern about development on A259 as squeezed by SDNP and Harbour AONB; small scale development only.

East should be considered for a new town with circa 2000+ houses.

East-West Corridor includes the site Oving Park, within the wider site S1 - East of Chichester/ Shopwyke. This site at Oving Park could sustainably deliver 100 new homes and facilities that the District needs.

Increased recreational disturbance. Impacts on water quality in the Harbour from increased loading to the WWTW. A new sub-area/ buffer zone should be created for sub-area to prevent strategic development within one mile of the boundary of the AONB.

Manhood Peninsula

Inappropriate; already over developed.

Growth in East Wittering and Bracklesham should be contained by clearly defined settlement boundaries. Parish should retain rural character and setting. Accessibility to and connectivity between the existing network of footpaths, bridleways, cycle ways and other outdoor recreational and leisure assets should be improved.

Self-sufficiency for Selsey, and to provide infrastructure improvements, large scale housing and employment provision should be part of the vision. S4 is supported

Selsey is a cul-de-sac, with one road in/out; need to improve road system before any more development.

Welcome recognition of sensitive environment in the Manhood Peninsula area, but also fact that the designated sites are an asset to the community which bring economic benefits to the area.

North of Plan Area

North must take some share of new housing.

Will ruin the countryside and surrounding villages.

Vision reflects constraints; very poor infrastructure, employment and transport provision

Question 5: Objectives

(a) Do you agree with the Objectives for the Plan area set out above?

(b) Please suggest any changes that you think should be made to the Objectives for the Local Plan Review.

TOTAL: 62 responses Yes – 51

1104755; 746653; 375108; 1103272; 1105257; 375108; 375315 (West Itchenor PC); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 1102692; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375142 (Historic England); 375318 (Wisborough Green PC); 381100; 396970; 755714; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates Ltd); 1104753; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1105988; 1106172 (Oving PC); 1106210; 1106486 (Natural England); 1110024; 1110054; 374954; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners for England); 375303 (Southbourne PC); 376056 (WSCC); 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management Ltd); 416457; 557814; 558534 (Luken MDP Ltd obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 653668 (Luken MDP Ltd obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (Luken MDP Ltd obo Seaward properties Ltd; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken MDP Ltd obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 974389 (Casa Coeva); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne PC); 1106452 (West Wittering PC); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1114183; 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold PC); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore LLP); 1115333; 1115347; 585871; 755602 (Savills UK Bloor Homes Southern); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally agree but comments include:

Few of previous objectives appear to have been implemented or commenced.

Objectives are sensible but need to know OAN and need for economic development.

Plan positively to meet all housing needs and consequent need for infrastructure; housing that is fit for purpose.

Smaller build sites over large autonomous housing developments to retain the architectural character of area, while boosting the local economy

Majority of comments relate to issues with A27 capacity and lack of Government investment to improve situation. Nothing to suggest capacity of the A27 has increased, therefore can not deliver more than 435 dpa. Road infrastructure and lack of Government's investment limits further development. Manhood road infrastructure has no capacity for future housing.

Strengthen current Objective 3.31 "Support and promote initiatives to mitigate the impacts of congestion and manage traffic flows on the road network, especially the A27".

No increase south of the A27 unless there is the ability to create a new town with all required infrastructure.

Foul and storm water drainage issues.

Housing numbers too high; too much to south of City why not to the north?

Make provision for new homes of the right quality, location, type, size and tenure.

Southbourne identified as an area for improvement to fulfil needs of local people and be focus of sustainable growth. Given Southbourne's position in terms of transport links and the facilities, it is an appropriate location for a strategic level of growth.

Continued allocation at Tangmere.

Support agricultural and horticultural industry; industry relies on temporary/transitory staff (key worker provision?)

Environmental impact concern; possible development of fracking and acidisation in the South Downs and how this affects watercourses.

Need to reconsider wording of Objective 3.23 where "whilst accommodating the development needs of the community" could be read as a caveat to conserving and enhancing the district's historic environment i.e. only conserving and enhancing the historic environment insofar as it does not obstruct meeting those development needs. Objective should be revised with deletion of wording "whilst accommodating the development needs of the community".

Welcome objectives to conserve and enhance wildlife and habitats; ensure sustainable use of resources; manage and adapt to coastal change; and to create networks of linked green spaces.

Looking for net gains to biodiversity; recommend additional wording "Provide multi-functional green space, and sustainably managed habitats, including woodland".

Need more explicit reference to health and well-being; with ageing population could recognise need for health and social care staff; retail to promote healthy high streets.

Strengthen issue of Traffic Calming and Parking at para 3.33 which specifically refers to Service Villages.

Question 6: Settlement Categories

(a) Should the settlement categories as defined in the hierarchy above be carried forward into the Local Plan Review?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 80 responses Yes – 51

1103008; 1104014; 757796; 1104136 (Bosham Association); 1104438; 1104755; 375108; 746653; 753618; 755714; 1103272; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 396970; 559554; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 863845; 1021645; 1102692; 1104753; 1105830; 1106023 (Cllr Purnell); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106210; 1106522 (Southern Planning Practice obo D C Heaver & Eurequity IC Ltd); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estates Ltd); 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 389541 (Loxwood Society); 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas); 416457; 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 805959 (Iceni Projects obo Fishbourne Developments Ltd); 974389 (Casacoevo); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1106566; 1110024; 1110046; 1110054; 1110135; 1114183; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114796 (Gladman Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114823 (Savills UK obo Hall and Woodhouse); 1114922 (Iceni Projects obo Orchestra Land); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (PRP Architects obo Seaward Properties); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 806517 (Neame Sutton obo Crayfern Homes Ltd); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1115333; 1115347; 1115654; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

General

Generally agree categories are reasonable.

Opportunities in many settlements for development justified for local need, wider community and district benefits; should not be restricted simply as settlement is not identified within a development category or to protect individual interests.

Should consider capacity of settlement to absorb new development without harming its historic character; gaps need to be maintained and important wild areas need to be protected from future development.

Should reflect role settlements WILL take in the next plan (e.g. Bosham/Broadbridge and Fishbourne from service village to settlement hub), can then identify community facilities and services needed to be more sustainable/self-sufficient.

Types of development and facilities should be used as guide but should not prevent potentially larger sites coming forward.

Insufficient growth can have downward effect on population growth and facilities in village.

inflexible, particularly in lower tiers and for unnamed rural settlements; approach restricts opportunities in locations where development would not result in unacceptable environmental impacts but could bring major community and economic benefits.

Expansion of each category would lead to more of a dispersal approach to development.

New settlements should also be located according to this principle.

Chichester

Chichester is the most appropriate location for new development; provides access to a full range of employment, education, transport, medical, retail and entertainment; support east/west corridor strategy. Parish boundaries should not limit proposals.

Unlikely that Chichester can take all of development; role of the settlement hubs should be altered to accommodate higher proportion of housing needs.

Development should be focused onto the sub regional centre and Settlement Hubs

Settlement hubs

Settlement hubs are south of the A27 and due to the difficulties of access/egress from those villages these need to be put into the Service village category.

Southbourne needs increased infrastructure as settlement hub.

Tangmere needs to have its range of social and community facilities improved before it has any more houses; its separate identity should be retained.

East Wittering/Bracklesham and Selsey equivalent to villages such as Bosham, Fishbourne etc. due to no rail; cul-de-sac for development and

few services and facilities.

Infrastructure overloaded already; exacerbate the Stockbridge roundabout bottle neck. Small schemes only to deliver affordable housing for local people and housing for the elderly only; no requirement for additional housing to meet local needs (starter homes become second homes).

Not for those areas S / SE of the A27, where the road infrastructure is already unable to cope with the level of traffic. The north at least benefit from an alternative 'old road' via Hambrook to spread the load of traffic.

Smaller sustainable developments that are truly energy self-sufficient,

Service villages

Bosham/Broadbridge is one village/parish; correctly shown as a Service Village

Hambrook Nutbourne is unsuitable as a service village; limited facilities, bottle neck to road, too far from Chichester and Havant. Lack of infrastructure. Previously identified for 25 but has already taken 110 houses.

Hambrook, Nutbourne and Chidham need to be recognised for their own identity.

Fishbourne has the potential to accommodate increased growth and contribute towards meeting the Council's housing requirements.

Agree Camelsdale / Hammer is located within the appropriate settlement category. However, reference to small scale housing development should be replaced with appropriate levels of housing development; would provide flexibility for individual settlements.

Rest of Plan Area

Oving falls into the "rest of plan" area; has very poor access to facilities.

Need to ensure some rural communities continue to thrive.

Types of development acceptable in the countryside considered restrictive.

**Question 7: Are there any settlements that you think should be added, removed, or moved into a different category?
Please indicate which settlements and give reasons.**

TOTAL: 39 responses Yes – 29

1103160; 757796; 375108; 746653; 753618; 1103272; 375315 (West Itchenor PC); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1102692; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105830; 1106023; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook PC); 375303 (Southbourne PC); 375318 (Wisborough Green PC); 379252; 381100; 753815; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates Ltd); 1104753; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106172 (Oving PC); 1106452 (West Wittering PC); 1114183; 1114793 (Huckleberry Developments); 1114796 (Gladman); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners for England); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas (Chichester) Ltd); 558534 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Hanbury Properties); 653668 (Luken Beck MDP Ltd obo Barratt Homes); 973832 (Savills UK obo Suez (Sita UK)); 1106099 (Westbourne PC); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore LLP); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Settlement Hubs should be moved to Service Village category; poor road infrastructure.

Should reflect the role settlements WILL take in the next plan; elevate Bosham/Broadbridge and Fishbourne to Settlement Hub; provide opportunity for community facilities and services needed to become more sustainable/self-sufficient.

Settlement hub category should be split/clarified; some settlements are similar size but not as sustainable e.g. East/West Wittering versus Tangmere & Southbourne.

Boundaries to proposed Settlement hubs should not be defined by parish boundaries; take account of geographic nature; gaps need to be maintained and important wild areas protected.

East of the city identified as Strategic site S1 is currently classed as Rest of Plan area; should be included in Sub-Regional Centre category.

Move Southbourne from a settlement hub to service village; would reduce pressure for development on sensitive area.

Support Southbourne; appropriate location to accommodate a strategic development site.

Tangmere nowhere near being Settlement Hub; need infrastructure, school, roads, leisure facilities, shops and particularly transport to be in

place.

Bracklesham should be designated a Service village; loss of commercial use should be resisted and expanding existing tourist use should be supported.

Support inclusion of Huston & Birdham as service villages.

S7 and S8 should be removed (urban sprawl); people feel necessity to be near sea.

Oving/Drayton should remain classified as "Rest of Plan Area" not be reclassified as a strategic development site; poor infrastructure.

Hambrook Nutbourne is unsuitable as a service village; should be moved to 'rest of plan area'. Poor infrastructure, bottleneck access to the Main Rd, a limited railway service and is too far from the main centres of Chichester or Havant.

Hambrook and Nutbourne benefit from excellent public transport connections, including access to train station and bus services on A259.

Nutbourne East; Nutbourne West and Hambrook - service village list unclear as to whether all three remain as service villages or if list has been reduced; suggest all three should continue to have their own SPA boundaries and be treated individually.

East Wittering/Bracklesham should be redefined as a service village; lack of infrastructure, congestion on A286. Suburban housing and traffic would detract from the area's attraction as a holiday destination. Insufficient pipe and pumping capacity of waste water to Sidlesham WWT; agricultural land highly productive used largely for specialist high value crops.

Westhampnett now part of Chichester.

Chichester Marina be included as defined settlement in recognition of existing and potential future residential community which complements the commercial and marine environment located here.

Contradiction between settlements listed in hierarchy and those listed in Sustainability Appraisal i.e. what are the boundaries of "Southbourne Strategic Location" (S5), "Hambrook/Nutbourne Strategic Location" (S9)"Southbourne Village (N26), Hermitage (N14) and Nutbourne (N20) Non Strategic Locations". Needs clarification

Insufficient growth can have negative effect on population demographic and services.

Funtington. This is a village that needs to retain its school and can be enlarged easily.

Development close to areas of employment. Need examination into how major new development can improve the sustainability of the Secondary and Tertiary settlements.

Question 8: Service Villages

(a) Should neighbouring settlements in the same parish continue to be treated as one Service Village when planning development and facilities (e.g. Bosham/Broadbridge)?

(b) Please provide any further comments on the above.

TOTAL: 58 responses Yes - 42

1103008; 1103160; 757796; 1104014; 1104136 (Bosham Association); 1104438; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 746653; 753618; 755714; 863845; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 396970; 753815; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1021645; 1104753; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376799; 389541 (Loxwood Society); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 974389 (Casacoevo); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1110024; 1110046; 1110054; 1110135; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114796 (Gladman Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1115347; 1115654; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Remain as they are.

If share facilities then consider themselves as one; if they are distinct then no; differences need to be recognised.

Boundaries and gaps between historic settlements should be maintained. Coalescence of settlements should be avoided and historically distinct areas remain definable.

'Made' Bosham Neighbourhood Plan includes all area within the parish including Upper Bosham/Broadbridge, must be considered one Service Village. Bosham and Broadbridge function together.

Bosham/Broadbridge are NOT neighbouring settlements. Bosham is formed of one parish

Full weight is given to Neighbourhood Plans (if they have been 'made') for development and facilities .

Some have significantly different circumstances that warrant them being treated separately. ie Bosham & Broadbridge have significantly different locational & sustainability criteria. Bosham is wholly within the AONB and Broadbridge has direct access to the 700 bus service & its own train station. Similarly with Nutbourne E / W / Hambrook, Hambrook is furthest from bus & train services & is less sustainable. Nutbourne East can therefore accommodate significantly more development than Hambrook.

Chidham and Hambrook - places function together; should continue to be a service village.

Viability of communities should be considered; Nutbourne straddles two parishes of Southbourne and Chidham & Hambrook and each of these Parishes has a Neighbourhood Plan in force.

Nutbourne is a settlement which can accommodate significant additional growth as a Service Village or as part of Southbourne Hub. Similarly, part of Earnley Parish which adjoins East Wittering / Bracklesham settlement is sustainable location. Key consideration is sustainable patterns of growth regardless of administrative boundaries; current hierarchy reflects this principle.

Bosham/Broadbridge and Nutbourne/Hambrook have far better transport options (train stations and better access to regional road network) and access to employment centres, hospital and higher education facilities than Selsey and East Wittering. As such, they are more sustainable.

Closely located settlements provide opportunities for shared services and facilities where it may not be environmentally appropriate or viable to duplicate services in each settlement.

Sustainability of each settlement should be considered in isolation. Council should seek to maintain the separation between and distinction of individual settlements.

Depends upon the service relationships between the different parts of the Parish.

Camelsdale / Hammer should continue to be referred to as one settlement as Hammer is a hamlet. Housing development and any other development type is likely to take place in Camelsdale rather than Hammer. This would assist to serve the hamlet.

Vision document states Chichester is a special place - it won't be if it is entirely undistinguishable from everywhere else.

Loxwood has two hamlets, Alfold Bars and Rownstreet Common which are separated from the service village of Loxwood.

Plaiستow & Ifold should not be one service village. Separated by 2.5km lane - 60mph limit, no pavements. Inadequate public transport. Unsustainable connection, does not comply with NPPF. Linking the two masks lack of facilities/services in Ifold; does not allow for policies to address this. Illogical as Ifold is closer to Loxwood - but not for whole village and difficult in winter months.

Tangmere not accessible from Shopwyke on foot; any facilities available to residents of Tangmere are not necessarily available to those in adjoining locations. Separation may also avoid coalescence.

West Wittering, situated within the East Wittering settlement area, look to west and enjoy rural character of land and proximity to harbour. Experience has shown priorities differ from those in new housing in Bracklesham.

Combined area of Westbourne, Woodmancote and Aldsworth to continue to be considered as the single Service Village of Westbourne. There is no justification or reason for change.

Consider whether service villages close to the SDNPA should act as service villages for settlements over the boundary where the SDNPA intends making no provision for housing to accord with para 55 of the NPPF. Will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

Assess on a case by case basis. Where neighbouring settlements view themselves in this way then the Plan should acknowledge this.

Those preparing Neighbourhood Plans, then perhaps the local community is best placed to make the decision whether settlements within Parishes.

Contradiction between the settlements listed in this hierarchy and those listed in the Sustainability Appraisal i.e. what are the boundaries of "Southbourne Strategic Location" (S5), "Hambrook/Nutbourne Strategic Location" (S9)"Southbourne Village (N26), Hermitage (N14) and Nutbourne (N20) Non Strategic Locations". This needs clarification. SPNP deals with individual settlements within the Parish separately.

Remove East Wittering and Bracklesham from Settlement Hub category.

**Question 9: Which of the spatial principles listed below do you consider are most important in developing a strategy for development in the Local Plan Review?
Please provide details.**

TOTAL: 73 responses

1103008; 757796; 1104014; 1104136 (Bosham Association); 1104438; 1104958; 375337 (Environment Agency); 746653; 755714; 1103272; 1105257; 1105297; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 396970; 559554; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 863845; 1021645; 1102692; 1104753; 1105830; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 389541 (Loxwood Society); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 755400 (South Downs Society); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates Ltd); 974389 (Casacoevo); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106446; 1106486 (Natural England); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1106522 (Southern Planning Practice obo D C Heaver & Eurequity IC Ltd); 1106566; 1110000; 1110024; 1110046; 1110054; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114772 (Genesis Town Planning); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 753541 (PRP Architects obo Seaward Properties); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1103282 (Taylor Wimpey); 1115347; 1115654; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

First Priority:

Maximise re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land – 38

Focus development in locations where there is greatest accessibility to employment, local services and facilities – 12

Respect the character of the existing settlement pattern including maintaining gaps between settlements – 6

Focus development in locations where there is greatest potential to maximise sustainable travel (public transport, walking and cycling) – 6

Locate development to minimise its impact on protected or locally important landscapes, heritage and biodiversity – 5

Focus on locations and development that will deliver or contribute most to infrastructure and local facilities – 5

Focus on sites that can be delivered quickly to ensure a flexible development supply – 1

Second Priority:

Focus development in locations where there is greatest accessibility to employment, local services and facilities – 15

Locate development to minimise its impact on protected or locally important landscapes, heritage and biodiversity – 15

Respect the character of the existing settlement pattern including maintaining gaps between settlements – 14

Focus development in locations where there is greatest potential to maximise sustainable travel (public transport, walking and cycling) – 8

Maximise re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land – 4

Provide new housing and facilities to help sustain rural settlements – 4

Locate development to maximise use of existing available infrastructure capacity (e.g. transport, wastewater treatment) – 4

Focus on sites that can be delivered quickly to ensure a flexible development supply – 3

Locate development to maximise use of existing available infrastructure capacity (e.g. transport, wastewater treatment) – 3

Focus on locations and development that will deliver or contribute most to infrastructure and local facilities – 2

Seek to increase development densities in locations close to local facilities or with good public transport links – 1

Third Priority:

Locate development to minimise its impact on protected or locally important landscapes, heritage and biodiversity – 13

Respect the character of the existing settlement pattern including maintaining gaps between settlements – 13

Locate development to maximise use of existing available infrastructure capacity (e.g. transport, wastewater treatment) – 11

Focus development in locations where there is greatest accessibility to employment, local services and facilities – 10

Focus on sites that can be delivered quickly to ensure a flexible development supply – 6

Seek to increase development densities in locations close to local facilities or with good public transport links – 5

Focus development in locations where there is greatest potential to maximise sustainable travel (public transport, walking and cycling) – 5

Focus on locations and development that will deliver or contribute most to infrastructure and local facilities – 4

Maximise re-use of previously developed (brownfield) land – 4

Provide new housing and facilities to help sustain rural settlements – 2

Question 10: Are there any other important spatial principles that should guide the development strategy on the Local Plan Review? Please provide details.

TOTAL: 50 responses

1104136 (Bosham Association); 757796; 746653; 1103272; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 375108; 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 863845; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch; 1105638; 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 396970; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1021645; 1102692; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106178 (Genesis Town Planning obo Cala Homes); 1106327; 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106475; 1106566; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376799; 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 974389 (Casacoevo); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110024; 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Creating compact settlements – creating linkages e.g. Bosham/ Broadbridge.

Ignore 'outside' demand, and concentrate on housing for local people and esp. local young people.

Retain gaps and green belt.

Concentrate on quality as well as quantity.

Smaller developments complement the district, and make it more difficult for major developers to wriggle out of CIL. Also enhance social wellbeing and cohesion.

Plan to provide a more uniform rate of completions.

The views of the residents.

Explore opportunity to make individual settlements (such as East Wittering) more sustainable, instead of accommodating most development along east-west corridor.

More holistic approach to housing locations e.g. taking account of demographics, facilities, public transport.

Locate development to manage the risk of flooding from all sources and contribute to reducing flood risk for existing communities.

Locate development to ensure the protection of groundwater and surface water quality and quantity.

Preserve and enhance existing tourist facilities e.g. improving access to Bracklesham beach.

Providing housing and facilities to sustain rural communities.

Limit strategic sites to those with good access to transport and infrastructure networks and facilities.

Maintain individual villages and resist concrete ribbon between the National Park and the Coast.

Development should be concentrated on smaller sites that can be integrated into existing communities

That the Parish of Bosham is regarded as one settlement and one service village and that all reference to Broadbridge be expunged.

Consider fewer but larger strategic sites.

Take account of the spatial principles that have been developed in Neighbourhood Plans.

Significant new housing should have good access to the improved A27 road.

Development should only take place where the infrastructure is already in place or can be provided before development.

Greater focus on housing in the North of the Plan area.

Prevent sprawl of villages to avoid coalescence and maintain separate identity of settlements e.g. along A259. Need to ensure distinct sense of departure and arrival between settlements, and identities are maintained through the individual character of each settlement, the treatment of the settlement edge, and the character of the gaps between settlements.

Development should adjoin or be in close proximity to railway stations.

Smaller developments in the South Downs National Park near to good infrastructure.

Too much emphasis on housing not enough emphasis on sustainability.

Should be separation of through traffic from local traffic to alleviate problems of congestion on the A27.

Create sub-area for Chichester Harbour AONB to prevent strategic development within one mile of the boundary of the AONB.

Conservation and enhancement of the historic environment should guide the location and nature of new development.

Capacity of settlements or areas of the district to absorb development (not just proximity to facilities and services) should be an important spatial principle.

Focus on locations where future waste water capacity is guaranteed without periodic discharges in the Chichester Harbour or excessive drainage into ditches

Focus on locations where development will be fully supported by transport improvements.

Plan must monitor and match changes in respect of the A27 and coastal defences.

Essential that no further development along the A259 to the west of Chichester until A27 junction improvements are in place.

The development strategy in the Local Plan should seek every opportunity to assist in mitigating and alleviating the existing problems associated with the A27.

Prioritise development locations to those with easier access potential to Havant/Portsmouth area.

Strike balance between strategic development and small scale opportunities which are deliverable.

Should not restrict development in the countryside and should allow flexibility for developments on sustainable, brownfield sites within the countryside.

Sites within areas covered by environmental/landscape designations e.g. AONB should not be discounted.

Focus on locations which will deliver affordable housing for local people which will be retained as affordable in perpetuity.

The development strategy should seek to allocate urban extensions and smaller sites on the edge of the most sustainable settlements that are capable of delivering new homes early on and throughout the Plan period.

Recognise interplay of economic, social and environmental issues.

Should include the objective to create sustainable development from settlements that may not currently be sustainable or self-sufficient.

Development is not sustainable if it erodes natural capital; it should be located where it can maximise gains to the environment.

Re-use of Previously Developed Land must be under the criteria that land is not of high environmental value.

Focus the majority of development towards the east-west corridor due to the facilities and lack of constraints in this area.