

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

Results of Consultation – Main Issues Raised (Questions 11 to 20)

Question 11: Subject to further investigation, which of the locations below do you consider may be suitable for large scale ('strategic') development (including 500 or more new dwellings)?

TOTAL: 227 responses

1103008; 1104005; 1104014; 1104039; 757796; 1104136 (Bosham Association); 1104148; 1104382; 1104438; 1104598; 1104773; 375268 (Earnley Parish Council); 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council); 745970; 746653; 1104773; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104924; 1104958; 1105101; 1105132; 1105136; 1105211; 1105235; 375108; 559953; 753618; 755482; 755714; 1103272; 1104244; 1105248; 1105250; 1105257; 1105258; 1105259; 1105273; 1105277; 1105291; 1105312; 1105346; 1105370; 1105371; 1105374; 1105434; 1105437; 1105462; 1105469 (Oving Clinic); 1105495; 1105581; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 1105643; 1105678; 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 396970; 559554; 755714; 1102847; 1104753; 1104971; 1105340; 1105342; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1105707 (Meadows Partnership); 1105747; 1105859; 1105949; 1105988; 1105989; 1106005; 1106022; 1106023; 1106033; 1106035; 1106051; 1106064; 1106066; 1106073; 1106152; 1106163; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106210; 1106221; 1106327; 1106336; 1106379; 1106393; 1106398; 1106400; 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106460; 1106470; 1106488; 1106522 (Southern Planning Practice obo D C Heaver & Eurequity IC Ltd); 1106556; 1106561; 1106562; 1106566; 1109958; 1109960; 1109961; 1109963; 1109965; 1109992; 1109997; 1110000; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375248 (Chichester City Council); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375273 (East Wittering & Bracklesham Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375322 (Paghham Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 379252; 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management Ltd); 416457; 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 753541 (PRP Architects obo Seaward Properties); 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 805959 (Iceni Projects obo Fishbourne Developments); 973832 (Savills UK obo SUEZ); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1104971; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105041; 1105192; 1105374; 1105486; 1105543; 1105581; 1105704; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106351; 1106352; 1106418; 1106449; 1106451; 1106453; 1106484; 1106489; 1106512; 1106528; 1106533; 1106537; 1109982; 1109983; 1110013; 1110040; 1110042; 1110047; 1110054; 1110125; 1110135; 1110172; 1113893; 1113894; 1114183; 1114186; 1114207; 1114210; 1114212; 1114221; 1114234; 1114236; 1114268; 1114273; 1114286; 1114295; 1114318; 1114323; 1114325; 1114338; 1114341; 1114474; 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114767 (Chesters Commercial obo CSS); 1114793 (Huckleberry Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114922 (Iceni Projects

obo Orchaestra Land); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115329; 1115333; 1115347; 1115614; 1115654; 1115662 (Hague Farms); 1115669; 1115673

Possible strategic location	Reasons for suitability	Reasons for lack of suitability
S1 - East of Chichester/Shopwyke area	<p>Not considered to be of high environmental value and development would not have negative landscape or heritage impacts.</p> <p>Any environmental impacts here can be mitigated and outweighed by positive impacts of the development.</p> <p>One of 2 areas where new residents can travel by foot/cycle/public transport to work and where large numbers of new dwellings would not overwhelm the existing settlement.</p> <p>Within easy access to road network.</p>	<p>Would erode the gap between Tangmere and Oving and damage relationship with the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Would damage Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>Reliance on Bognor Road roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p> <p>Would increase urban sprawl.</p>
46 respondents said S1 East of Chichester/Shopwyke area is a good option		
S2 - South-East of Chichester (south of A259)	<p>One of 2 areas where new residents can travel by foot/cycle/public transport to work and where large numbers of new dwellings would not overwhelm the existing settlement.</p> <p>Within easy access to road network.</p>	<p>Reliance on Bognor Road roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p> <p>Would increase urban sprawl.</p>
49 respondents said S2 South-East of Chichester (south of A259) is a good option		
S3 - East Wittering/ Bracklesham	<p>Development would be suitable at Church Road as it is near all facilities and would relieve the need for cars.</p> <p>Already have facilities which would support new</p>	<p>Transport and traffic implications would be severe as there is only one road in and out. These roads are at capacity already.</p> <p>Lack of local jobs would lead to dormitory settlements.</p>

	<p>development.</p> <p>Sustainably located for new development.</p> <p>Suitable across multiple development sites.</p>	<p>Poor access to facilities and schools.</p> <p>Development would impact upon air quality.</p> <p>Unacceptable impact on character of area and the landscape.</p>
<p>25 respondents said S3 East Wittering/Bracklesham is a good option</p>		
S4 - Selsey	<p>Already have facilities which would support new development.</p> <p>Sustainably located for new development.</p> <p>The area would deliver the Council's ambition for Selsey to become more self-sufficient and to provide infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>Poor access to facilities and schools.</p> <p>Transport and traffic implications would be severe as there is only one road in and out. These roads are at capacity already.</p>
<p>25 respondents said S4 Selsey is a good option</p>		
S5 - Southbourne	<p>Easy access to road and rail network.</p> <p>Access to sewage network.</p> <p>Already have facilities which would support new development, including employment areas, schools, shops and a railway station.</p> <p>Additional development would help the settlement to grow and develop its role as a Settlement Hub and support widening the range of local facilities.</p> <p>Close proximity to Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) area.</p> <p>New access onto A27 could be achieved.</p>	<p>Large scale development cannot be accommodated as would place a strain on Stein Road level crossing. A north-south crossing or a new link road to A27 between Fishbourne and Emsworth required.</p> <p>Reliance on Fishbourne roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p> <p>Would unacceptably increase traffic on A259 which will increase pollution.</p> <p>Would harm setting of South Downs National Park.</p>

	<p>Links across the A27 could relieve recreational pressure on Chichester Harbour by providing links to the National Park.</p> <p>Land surrounding Southbourne is relatively free of constraints.</p>	
<p>60 respondents said S5 Southbourne is a good option</p>		
<p>S6 - Tangmere</p>	<p>Additional homes in Tangmere should be restricted to the Strategic Development Location.</p> <p>Tangmere was rigorously assessed through the Local Plan process and has been found to be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Predominantly Grade 1 agricultural land and development would reduce the amount of land available for food.</p> <p>Area is remote and will encourage car dependency,</p> <p>Increased flood risk.</p> <p>Negative impacts on wildlife and biodiversity;</p> <p>Oving and Tangmere should be kept separate.</p> <p>Any development should be restricted to the Strategic Development Location.</p> <p>Increased car usage would put additional pressure on minor roads through village.</p> <p>Negative impact on character of village.</p> <p>Would harm setting of South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Would increase urban sprawl.</p> <p>No brownfield element at this location.</p>
<p>30 respondents said S6 Tangmere is a good option</p>		

<p>S7 - Broadbridge area</p>	<p>Easy access to road and rail network.</p> <p>Close proximity to Chichester city.</p> <p>Close to Fishbourne which has excellent public transport services with a railway station and bus stops offering services to Chichester and other settlements, including London.</p> <p>Development could increase modal shift to public transport and make the settlement more sustainable.</p>	<p>Not suitable for strategic development as it is a service village.</p> <p>Would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the South Downs National Park and the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Development would encourage ribbon development and join Bosham/Broadbridge to Fishbourne.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Would increase traffic congestion in village and neighbouring areas.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure is already under pressure.</p> <p>Insufficient public transport links to areas of employment (for example, Chichester and Portsmouth).</p> <p>Drainage is poor.</p> <p>Reliance on Fishbourne roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p> <p>Would unacceptably increase traffic on A259 which will increase pollution.</p> <p>Would harm setting of South Downs National Park.</p>
<p>30 respondents said S7 Broadbridge area is a good option</p>		
<p>S8 - West of Fishbourne</p>	<p>Close proximity to Chichester city.</p> <p>Development could increase modal shift to public</p>	<p>Reliance on Fishbourne roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p>

	<p>transport and make the settlement more sustainable.</p> <p>Fishbourne has excellent public transport services with a railway station and bus stops offering services to Chichester and other settlements, including London.</p>	<p>Would unacceptably increase traffic on A259 which will increase pollution.</p> <p>Would harm setting of South Downs National Park.</p>
<p>37 respondents said S8 West of Fishbourne is a good option</p>		
S9 - Hambrook/ Nutbourne	<p>Easy access to road and rail network.</p>	<p>Reliance on Fishbourne roundabout which is congested and accident prone.</p> <p>Would harm setting of South Downs National Park.</p>
<p>52 respondents said S9 Hambrook/Nutbourne is a good option</p>		
S10 - Oving/Drayton	<p>Drayton is adjacent to the railway allowing a new station to be provided, and it is close to the A27.</p>	<p>Entirely Grade 1 agricultural land and development would reduce the amount of land available for food.</p> <p>Will increase flood risk through disruption to aquifer.</p> <p>Damage to the historic environment and conservation area and unique character of the village.</p> <p>Lack of facilities and infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>Oving and Tangmere should be kept separate.</p> <p>Access is currently restricted due to works on Oving traffic lights.</p> <p>Sewage system is already at capacity.</p> <p>Would encourage car dependency and increase pressure on</p>

		<p>road network.</p> <p>Object to loss of farmland.</p> <p>Negative impact on character of village.</p> <p>Would increase urban sprawl.</p> <p>No brownfield element at this location.</p>
<p>12 respondents said S10 Oving/Drayton was a good option.</p>		

General comments:

Any new strategic allocation should be restricted to the sites already examined in the Local Plan. Where strategic sites are subject to an approved Neighbourhood Plan, any additional housing requirements should be allocated within Strategic Development Locations that was subject to the Neighbourhood plan consultation.

Housing should not be considered in isolation. To be sustainable, large housing sites need to be located where their residents can walk to bus stops, walk/cycle to the settlement centre, employment sites, health and leisure centres/facilities.

No strategic sites can be delivered without radical road improvements, including a secured and deliverable A27 strategy.

Housing best suited to the west of Chichester which has easier access to the A27 and the railway network. If houses are built to the east of the city, the road network would be unable to cope.

Need to sort out the road network and Southern rail – until this is done there is no attraction for industry and commerce to the area.

Should be developing city centre sites in order to minimise travel requirements and to encourage sustainable travel.

A new town of 2000+ houses to the east of Chichester, in Tangmere or towards the Arun boundary, would take the pressure off many small villages and permit new infrastructure and services.

Repurpose sites within Chichester city that are underused in order to accommodate strategic development that will be well served by existing

rail and bus services and close to city amenities.

Large scale development should be focussed at Settlement Hubs not Service Villages. Service villages lack the infrastructure to support large scale development to which the sub-regional centres and settlement hubs would be better placed, and more economically viable.

Development should be kept clear of the AONB and National Park to the west of Chichester as this has natural value and correlates to significant tourist income.

Large scale housing developments on Chichester Plain should be avoided at all costs. Smaller schemes integrated into existing communities would work better.

New housing is not needed.

Must priorities building on brownfield sites.

Large scale strategic development should be located close to Chichester which has the existing infrastructure, transport links and amenities to support additional people, and would have the least impact on surrounding villages and rural areas.

Chichester city has taken a disproportionate amount of development. Question its capacity for further growth given the extent of recent allocations.

The roads onto the Manhood Peninsula are inadequate for the current traffic.

Locations away from Chichester Harbour AONB and the South Downs National Park should be considered in the first instance.

Large scale development is likely to have a greater impact on rural villages.

Any strategic development should be located close to areas with significant employment opportunities and to established public transport links and designated cycle paths. There should also be easy access to education.

Full consideration of Local Plan needs compared with local constraints is required to establish whether an area is suitable or not.

Account should be taken of planned developments in Pagham when assessing the impact on traffic of the sites proposed for the Manhood Peninsula.

Work collaboratively with West Sussex County Council to deliver necessary infrastructure with housing, including the evidence base.

Determination of locations should be informed by a suitable landscape capacity and sensitivity study.

Investigation of sites must include assessment of natural assets and potential impacts of developing these sites. Allocation of strategic development and delivery policies should be informed by data relating to the functioning of ecological networks at a landscape scale and using site specific data. The background environmental evidence must be created before decisions on allocations are made. It is recommended that ecological appraisals are carried out for each potential allocation.

Neighbourhood plans should be the starting point for development.

Question 12: Locations for strategic development

(a) Are there other locations not listed that you think may be suitable for strategic development (including 500 or more dwellings)?

(b) Please provide details

TOTAL: 87 responses Yes – 28

1104136 (Bosham Association); 757796; 746653; 1104438; 1104924; 1104958; 753618; 1103272; 1105248; 1105258; 1105259; 1105312; 1105374; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1021645; 1104244; 1105291; 1105340; 1105437; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 1105678; 1106022; 1106023; 1106163; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 374954; 381100; 1102847; 1104753; 1105374; 1105859; 1105988; 1106005; 1106064; 1106066; 1106221; 1106327; 1106336; 1106379; 1106398; 1106449; 1106488; 1106537; 1109951; 1109960; 1109963; 1109982; 1109983; 1110000; 1110040; 1110042; 1110046; 1110054; 1113893; 1113894; 1114186; 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC obo Goodwood Estate Ltd); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 755400 (South Downs Society); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106351; 1106418; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106453; 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 1115614

Generally disagree – comments include:

Large developments of 500+ should not be encouraged and are not appropriate in the area.

Smaller development schemes are likely to be less detrimental to the local areas, infrastructure and communities.

Large scale developments should not be encouraged on Manhood Peninsula where there is only one traffic route in and out.

Small scale additions to existing settlements allowing them to grow organically are a more sustainable way to go.

Need to protect good to excellent agricultural land, essential for our rural economy and food security.

An update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is overdue before consideration is given to major developments.

Chichester area cannot support any more strategic developments as the roads are already at full capacity, even without completion of Shopwyke Lakes.

Area south of Oving is on grade 1 agricultural land, and would increase flood risk and impact on humans and wildlife.

Roads, schools and other facilities all need to be improved proportionally to development.

Must protect our land and our heritage for now and the future.

The infrastructure has not been tested with the current housing plan, how can we plan houses without transport modelling?

Strategic developments are not appropriate on the Chichester plain, particularly south and east of Chichester, due to increased flood risk.

Further housing that will result in additional traffic on the A27 will have a negative impact.

Not enough local schools and jobs to provide for additional development.

Areas within the town centre should be looked at for development, or smaller sustainable sites locally.

Question 13: Strategic housing development

(a) What approach should be taken to planning strategic housing development (500+ dwellings)?

(b) Please provide any comments on the above.

TOTAL: 74 responses

1104014; 757796; 1104438; 1104724 (Havant Borough Council); 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 375108; 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council);

746653; 1103272; 1105101; 1105257; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 375337 (Environment Agency); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1104753; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 1105678; 1105996; 1106022; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375263 (Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 396970; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 110504; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106066; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1109951; 1110000; 1110040; 1110042; 1110046; 1110135; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114796 (Gladman Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 753541 (PRP Architects obo Seaward Properties); 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 756580 (Sigman Planning Services obo Rydon Homes Ltd); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1115333; 1115347; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

The Local Plan Review should allocate strategic housing sites (500+ dwellings): 18

The Local Plan Review should indicate the broad distribution of strategic development, but leave allocation of sites to neighbourhood plans: 37

Another approach not listed above: 13

Comments:

Prevent urban spread

Prevent building for second homes.

Calculate local needs and build only to satisfy these.

Maintain green belt around Chichester to prevent further spread of 'suburbs'.

Promoted new housing development in all areas other than those specifically identified as being constrained under the NPPF.

Large scale developments need to be planned so that all residents are close to facilities and transport links. They should not be located where they would add to congestion within settlement centres or around the Chichester ring road.

Large housing developments should include provision of community facilities or employment land that is accessible to the wider community.

The strategic site in Tangmere should be kept within the boundary supported in Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan. Additional land allocated for housing would result in piecemeal development. Retaining a single strategic site ensures infrastructure is provided.

Existing Strategic Development Locations should have increased density before greenfield sites are considered.

The plan should include the good features in the FAD (Facilitating Appropriate Development) document, concentrating on providing quality developments that are suited to the area.

Strategic housing sites should be allocated, and should include clear criteria on how sites should be developed, to ensure coherent schemes are in place for sustainable water management and where site specific environmental issues exist.

Chichester is being destroyed by excessive development. Pressure should be placed on government to keep numbers of new houses at a level that is economically sustainable and recognises the large areas of the district that are under environmental designations.

Fewer, larger developments are preferable to smaller piecemeal developments in order to address housing needs and provide the necessary infrastructure development.

This a huge challenge – need to look out of the box as the District is being squeezed.

The identification and promotion of smaller sites than can be readily integrated into existing settlements should take precedence unless a site can be identified for a complete new settlement.

Given housing requirements, consideration of the solution where land along the A27 corridor between Chichester and Arundel is provided to create a new settlement including facilities and infrastructure.

Sites should be allocated in an area where there is no neighbourhood plan, and the parish is not intending to have one.

The allocation of specific sites in the Local Plan Review would provide more certainty and allow developers to undertake the necessary preliminary work to ensure earlier delivery to meet objectively assessed housing needs. However, if Neighbourhood Plans are made or reviewed in a timely manner alongside the Local Plan Review process then this method would achieve the same objectives.

The East-West corridor is the optimal location for strategic development, particularly Southbourne, Tangmere and around Chichester.

Where a Parish Council is a Neighbourhood Plan authority it requires technical support from Chichester District Council, the Highway Authority and other specialist bodies.

Collaboration with West Sussex County Council is required during consideration of proposed sites for allocation, to seek advice on infrastructure requirements from proposed development, flooding and transport.

The Secretary of State has made it clear through recent appeals that Local Plans are expected to allocated strategic sites leaving more localised allocations to be included within Neighbourhood Plans. Perhaps in addition to 500+ dwellings, strategic sites should be defined with a smaller threshold, for example in excess of 100+.

Any allocation should be based on an up-to-date evidence base and ensure overall net gains to biodiversity and growth in natural capital.

CDC should ensure they have a robust 5 year housing supply in order to protect against unplanned and damaging development.

There is no timescale certainty in the neighbourhood planning process so local plans should allocate sites to give certainty.

The scale, complexity and lead in times required to bring forward strategic sites suggests that they should be allocated up front in the Local Plan Review. However, the approach taken should be flexible enough to allow parcels of land to come forward within a Strategic Development Location if they are immediately deliverable and do not prejudice the success of the overall site.

LPR should allocate broadly followed by a new Call for sites and then consultation and then site allocation document. This would give landowners a chance to submit land that they may have thought previously undevelopable due to current allocations. The strategic site allocation document should be accompanied by a Strategic Transport review and action plan.

Spread the number of houses around the whole area and do not try to cram them all into one field.

Brownfield sites should be used.

Adequate infrastructure is vital before strategic allocations are made.

Local Plan Review should not leave allocation of strategic sites to neighbourhood plans or a subsequent site allocation document because a delay in the allocation of development sites will result in a delay in the delivery of new homes. A shortfall in new homes early in the Plan period could render the reviewed Plan out of date soon after its adoption. This would in turn leave the District at risk from speculative five year housing land supply planning applications.

Approach will depend on level of housing need. Encourage the Council to keep an open mind about location and scale of development. A reliance on sites over 500 units could be counter-productive.

Essential to identify at least one strategic scale site within the Plan Review that can deliver across the plan period in a location that has strong sustainability attributes.

Consider effective master planning of large strategic sites, working with the Neighbourhood Planning Group, to ensure early delivery to sustain a readily available supply of housing for the district.

Question 14: Subject to further investigation, which of the settlements/ broad locations below do you consider may be suitable to accommodate less than 500 new dwellings?

Please indicate the broad amount of development you think should be planned for.

TOTAL: 61 responses

1104014; 757796; 746653; 1104438; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1103272; 1105291; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 1106022; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 1104753; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1105988; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106178 (Genesis Town Planning obo Cala Homes); 1106327; 1106336; 1106446; 1110000; 1110024; 1110046; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375263 (Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376799; 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110135; 1110148; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114772; 1114793 (Huckleberry Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114831 (Luken Beck); 1115333; 1115347; 1115623 (Strutt and Parker LLP obo William Lacey Group); 1115654; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Non-strategic location	No development or very limited	Under 50 dwellings	50 – 100 dwellings	100 – 250 dwellings	250 – 500 dwellings
N1 Birdham	6	5	2	1	3
N2 Bosham (village)	19	3	0	0	0
N3 Boxgrove	10	6	2	0	2

N4 Broadbridge	3	4	3	0	2
N5 Camelsdale & Hammer	0	5	1	1	1
N6 Chichester city (Southern Gateway area)	0	2	3	7	6
N7 Chichester city (elsewhere)	0	3	3	6	8
N8 East of Chichester (S of Oving/Shopwyke Road)	5	3	2	6	6
N9 SE of Chichester (A27 Bognor junction area)	5	0	9	7	7
N10 SW of Chichester (Fishbourne junction area)	4	3	1	5	2
N11 East Wittering/Bracklesham	3	7	1	2	5
N12 Fishbourne	4	6	4	2	3
N13 Hambrook	4	6	3	3	3
N14 Hermitage	4	6	3	0	0
N15 Hunston	4	5	0	3	3
N16 Ifold	2	5	2	1	1
N17 Kirdford	1	6	2	0	2
N18 Loxwood	1	6	3	0	1
N19 North Mundham	1	6	1	1	2
N20 Nutbourne	4	6	1	0	3
N21 Oving (village)	7	7	0	1	3
N22 Plaistow	4	4	2	0	2
N23 Runcton	2	4	2	1	2
N24 Selsey	3	4	1	2	3
N25 Sidlesham	2	5	0	0	4
N26 Southbourne	6	4	0	1	5

village					
N27 Stockbridge	3	5	2	1	0
N28 Tangmere (within existing SDL)	1	2	3	3	13
N29 Tangmere (elsewhere)	4	7	2	3	7
N30 West Wittering (village)	7	8	1	1	3
N31 Westbourne	4	5	3	0	1
N32 Westhampnett	2	4	2	3	3
N33 Wisborough Green	1	4	3	1	2

Question 15: Locations for housing development

(a) Are there other locations not listed that you think may be suitable to accommodate housing development?

(b) Please provide details.

TOTAL: 52 responses Yes – 11

375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 383360 (Chichester Society); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 375263 (Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1115623 (Strutt and Parker LLP obo William Lacey Group); 757796; 746653; 753618; 755714; 1103272 1104753; 1105638; 1105830; 1106023; 375142 (Historic England); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 381100; 740359; 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 974389 (Casa Coevo); 1110000; 1110046; 1114772 (Genesis Town Planning obo Mr J Ferguson); 397040 (LRM Planning obo Hallam Land Management); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas); 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 756611 (Savills UK obo Brookhouse); 806517 (Neame Sutton obo Crayfern Homes Ltd); 1103282 (Taylor Wimpey); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114796 (Gladman Developments); 1115333; 1115347

General comments:

Top priority should be given to protecting Chichester Harbour AONB.

Bosham is one of the most iconic rural harbour-side villages and no significant development should be allowed on greenfield sites within the AONB.

Previously developed land should be fully utilised before further agricultural land is released.

Chichester city can absorb more housing than planned because of the strength of its facilities. Greater choice and affordability in housing stock will create a more dynamic city with a younger working population.

Non-strategic sites in rural villages that need to be sustained.

Encourage flats over shops. Many that exist are unused and others could be created.

Large scale development is likely to have a greater impact on the character of the smaller villages, such as Fishbourne, Hambrook and Nutbourne, which suggests that other potential locations may be more suitable. However, careful attention also has to be given to the setting of Chichester.

The capacity of Chidham and Hambrook to absorb further development can only be determined once suitable infrastructure has been put in place. A Housing Needs Survey commissioned by CDC in conjunction with the Parish Council needs to be undertaken to determine the housing need for existing residents and for those with local connections.

It is divisive to comment on how the housing number should be divided across the District. The Local Plan has a mechanism to allocate housing to parishes and Neighbourhood Plans have been developed to work with this objective.

Determination of locations should be informed by suitable landscape sensitivity and capacity study.

It is not possible to suggest suitable locations without more information about the current environmental capacity of the district.

Lynchmere is an important settlement to deliver housing development in the north of the District.

6.6 hectares of land to the east of Runcton, between Runcton and the HDA, bounded by Marsh Lane to the north and west, the B2166 to the south and Runcton HDA to the east. This site can accommodate approximately 200 dwellings.

The A27 should be addressed before any further housing is allowed. There is insufficient industry locally to support an influx of people. Farmland must be preserved.

Ifold is unsustainable and lacks infrastructure and drainage. Windfall development affects character and biodiversity, and type of housing built does not meet local need. Windfall development should be restricted as windfalls do not allow issues to be addressed through the planning system, does not comply with the NPPF and is detrimental to residents and biodiversity.

Plaistow should not have development due to its lack of sustainability and the impact on the village.

East of Lavant Road is suitable for less than 500 dwellings.

There are locations outside the AONB which are sustainable, for example Bramber Plant Centre. The site benefits from a location with frequent bus services, is close to the country club and public house. These are indicators that the village is not the only sustainable location and the settlement/broad location for housing at West Wittering should be amended to refer to the parish of West Wittering.

Land south of Tangmere, Land south of Hunston, Land east of Westbourne, Land east of Drayton Lane, Land at Birdham, and Land west of Oving would be suitable. Land north of Southbourne would also be suitable for at least 450 dwellings.

Chichester Marina could accommodate a non-strategic amount of development.

Further housing may be accommodated at Shopwyke SDL. There is potential to build further housing adjacent to the administrative boundary in Hermitage, Emsworth. This urban fringe location shows a distinct example where urban growth may not need to be impinged by the AONB designation.

Without knowledge of constraints and opportunities for each settlement it is not possible to prioritise numbers of dwellings per settlement at this stage. Equally OAN is not known. Perhaps in the light of housing needs, it would be helpful to explore those areas subject to existing allocations, with and without planning permission, to assess whether or not increased densities might alleviate the requirement to allocate additional land.

Southbourne is the largest settlement in the west of the Plan area and is defined as a settlement hub. It has good communications by road and rail, a range of local facilities and employment opportunities, and is relatively unconstrained for both strategic and non-strategic development.

Land at Barnfield Drive is already allocated for retail, but in case this is not deliverable across the whole site should also be allocated for residential.

Land south of Clay lane, Chichester.

All options should be considered on the edge of Chichester given its position in the settlement hierarchy.

Land at Foxbury Lane, Westbourne. The site is available now and able to deliver a range of dwelling types.

The amount of housing each settlement should accommodate over the new Local Plan period should be determined by an Objective Assessment of Housing Need and then apportioned to each settlement to ensure sustainable and balanced growth is achieved throughout the District.

Encourage the Council to keep an open mind about location and scale of development. A reliance of sites over 500 units could be counter-productive. We expect all sustainable locations within Chichester should be able to contribute towards meeting housing and development needs.

Land at Blackboy Lane and Clay Lane, Fishbourne.

There are sites identified within Westbourne capable of supporting small scale development in the countryside of up to 4 houses.

Question 16: Non-strategic housing development

(a) What approach should be taken to planning non-strategic housing development (<500 dwellings)?

(b) Please provide any comments on the above.

TOTAL: 68 responses

1104136 (Bosham Association); 757796; 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council); 1104438; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714; 1103272; 1105297; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105949; 1106022; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106446; 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110000; 1110024; 1110046; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375245 (Lichfields obo Church Commissioners); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375277 (Fishbourne Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 560001; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 753541 (Luken Beck obo Seaward Properties); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 832429 (Barton Willmore obo Martin Grant Homes); 878413 (Thakeham Homes); 974389 (Casa Coevo); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110135; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114796 (Gladman Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114831 (Luken Beck); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 558922; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1103282 (Taylor

Wimpey); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

The Local Plan Review should allocate non-strategic housing sites (<500 dwellings): 10

The Local Plan Review should indicate the broad distribution of non-strategic development, but leave allocation of sites to neighbourhood plans or a subsequent site allocation document: 41

Another approach not listed above: 3

Comments:

Proposals should promote compact developments associated with the local facilities. Comprehensive masterplanning showing how the whole development would be planned in phases with public open space provided on space.

Smaller allocations should be left to Neighbourhood Plans for the location to allow local concerns to be incorporated into the specific site. Neighbourhood Plans should be given prime importance in reference to the allocation of sites and infrastructure. The approach should be one in which dialogue is used to integrate all the stakeholders in a development under the general guidance of CDC.

Parish Councils are best placed to advise on the most sustainable and beneficial locations for new development. They are better placed to know what facilities they require and how a new development could benefit the settlement concerned.

The Local Plan Review should provide sufficient information, either within site allocations or in supporting policies, to ensure that the non-strategic housing sites are developed appropriately. Where necessary these should ensure coherent schemes are in place for sustainable water management and where site specific environmental issues exist then clear development principles are set out.

Major effort should be concentrated on smaller sites.

Non-strategic housing development should take account of the impact on infrastructure such as wastewater treatment capacity (including transfer capacity), recreational disturbance of protected areas and services such as doctors' surgery and schools. Proximity to employment and fast access to the A27 are also essential. Neighbourhood plans allow communities to address local issues with housing.

A single local plan should allocate all but the smallest of sites (less than 25 units) to give certainty. This is so the Council can deliver the quantum of housing required in the timescales required, and ensure the Council maintains a five year supply. The sites can be thoroughly examined at the Examination in Public and the sites progressed within the LDS. There is no such timescale certainty in the neighbourhood plan process. Neighbourhood plans provide a valuable part of the planning process when looking at details.

Smaller developments are better to conserve the character of the countryside and to enable tourism to enjoy the country without it being spoiled by large conurbations.

Where a neighbourhood plan is in place or being planned then it should be left to the neighbourhood plan groups to identify the sites, but where there is no NP or an intention to do one then the sites should be allocated.

Non-strategic housing should be broadly allocated but with Parish residents given a say on where and how.

The Local Plan Review should seek to allocate non-strategic housing sites. Leaving the allocation of sites to Neighbourhood Plans only may result in insufficient smaller sites being allocated in a timely manner to properly provide the flexible and robust housing land supply needed to ensure the plan is sound. Neighbourhood Plan groups will have the opportunity to have an input and comment on any proposed allocations in their areas through the Local Plan Review process.

Builders and landowners should not be allowed to ride roughshod over the district council.

Non-strategic housing development should address the issue of recreational disturbance to Chichester Harbour. Locations within Chichester Harbour AONB, or locations which would impact on the rural setting of Chichester Harbour AONB should be avoided.

Large-scale development is likely to have a greater impact on the character of the smaller villages such as Fishbourne, Hambrook and Nutbourne, which would, in itself, suggest that the other potential locations may be more suitable. However, careful attention also has to be given to the setting of Chichester.

The allocation of specific sites in the Local Plan Review would provide more certainty and allow developers to undertake the necessary preliminary work to ensure earlier delivery to meet objectively assessed housing needs. However, if Neighbourhood Plans are made or reviewed in a timely manner alongside the Local Plan Review process then this method would achieve the same objectives.

Strategic sites should be supplemented by a more general allocation of non-strategic sites at each settlement according to individual merit and characteristics. The use of settlement boundaries to control development is applied inflexibly to many appropriate developments. The appropriate use of more specific constraint policies would allow the growth needs of the area to be met in a more appropriate manner.

The Local Plan Review should plan for a range of sites in terms of location and including both strategic and smaller scale sites. The delivery of large scale sites is important in supplying much needed housing numbers but the promotion of small scale sites also contributes to unmet housing need and such sites can be accommodated more sensitively within the rural context.

Assess the need for housing and take into account the amount of new building already provided. Assess the reality of providing adequate infrastructure to mitigate against the impact of the development. Assess how far the proposed development complies with the definition of sustainable development in the parish's "made" Neighbourhood Plan. Assess the impact of development against the distinctive character of the village as set out in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

The overall strategy should remain a function of the Local Planning Authority and whilst the allocation of 500+ dwellings is clearly "strategic" it would also be helpful for the LPA to consider sites of more than 100 dwellings in any Local Plan Review, thus leaving Neighbourhood Plans to consider allocations of 50 units or less. If the allocation of sites is left to Neighbourhood Plans these should be progressed swiftly in tandem with the new Local Plan to ensure sites can progress and deliver the required amount of housing to meet needs over the new Local Plan period.

Any allocation must be based on an up-to-date evidence base and ensure overall net gains to biodiversity and growth in natural capital. Additionally CDC must ensure that they have a robust 5 year housing supply in order to protect against un-planned and damaging development.

Local Plan Review should take more positive steps to increase housing provision wherever possible. This should be achieved by introducing flexibility to bring forward additional non-strategic sites and windfall sites to boost the potential early delivery and supply of housing. Review the Settlement Capacity Profiles alongside the key documents cited previously as providing constraints to housing development.

Do not object to strategy but it is important that there is flexibility in the plan to ensure a wide range of suitable sites are identified and designated for housing development. This is likely to include identification of additional sites in a number of parishes.

The Local Plan Review should be prepared as a single document, rather than a two-stage process, to enable the delivery of housing in a more efficient timeframe.

The Local Plan Review should allocate the non-strategic housing sites that are adjacent to the larger settlements in order to ensure the delivery of new homes early in the Plan period. The Council should not delay the allocation of non-strategic sites by leaving the allocation of these sites to neighbourhood plans or a site allocation document.

Provide affordable housing. Give priority to views of community take holistic approach. Promote accommodation for younger families.

The approach will depend on level of housing need, and we encourage the Council to keep an open mind about location and scale of development. A reliance on sites over 500 units could be counter-productive. We expect all sustainable locations within Chichester should be able to contribute towards meeting housing and development needs.

The Council should take a proactive role with communities (Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plan groups), land owners and developers and develop a master or concept plan for each of the locations mentioned as N1 - N33. Such a master or concept plan could feed into any reviews of Neighbourhood Plans and take account of identified needs for each community and produce a comprehensive approach as part of a district wide development strategy

Question 17: The Economy

(a) Do you agree with the above planning policy aims for the economy and employment?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 58 responses Yes – 47

1104014; 757796; 1104438; 1104958; 1105257; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 753618; 755714; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 559554; 856633 (Theatres Trust); 1104753; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106446; 1110000; 1110046; 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 398366 (CBRE obo Premier Marinas); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1110054; 1110135; 1114793 (Huckleberry Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally yes; but comments include:

Clear policies should prevent the increase in trends of some business owners from being tempted to run down their businesses, so they can sell their sites to developers, in order to protect the important visitor economy in the Manhood Peninsula.

Need to include appropriate infrastructure policies to support local horticulture, food production and tourism economies and provide premises for small rural businesses.

Upgrade of the A27 is critical for the economic development of the area.

Existing sites of business operators need to be protected from residential developers in areas where employment opportunities are declining and/or the loss of a business has a negative impact on the wider area. Tourism needs to be promoted and encouraged.

Policy 10 should be retained.

If we encourage low paid jobs, people can then not afford to live here. Housing should be developed for local people and should be affordable. Should not have jobs that encourage people to move to the area.

Welcome the current policy aims for the economy and employment, and support the objectives of the relevant policies to develop a strong and thriving economy. High quality residential development is crucial in providing a sustainable economy. Residential developments generate employment, and also contribute significantly to the vitality and vibrancy of existing nearby town centres.

There need be very robust policies to ensure that employment and economic uses are not lost unnecessarily

Service Villages as well as settlement hubs and the City can provide employment opportunities and business premises.

It is important to ensure that policies which seek to protect existing employment do not do so to the detriment of the wider housing strategy. In particular, it is important that policies do not prevent redevelopment of existing previously developed land where existing employment uses are no longer viable or where continued use is at odds with the other environmental and sustainability objectives of the plan.

The economic aims of the plan are generally sound although it fails to acknowledge the true value of key economic drivers (including heritage and landscape considerations). The plan fails to offer appropriate safeguards to these important business interests and the physical and environmental elements that underpin them, and has not considered the impact of inappropriately sited housing and development upon them.

An additional planning policy aim should be to maximise the utilisation of Chichester College in the delivery of skills for entrepreneurial activity and local trades e.g. hospitality and the marine industry.

Policy aims should include support for existing small low rent units in addition to allocation of land for new modern units as these are beneficial for low margin and newly established activities which provide employment opportunities in locations outside Chichester City.

Essential that sufficient flexibility is retained such that the commercial marina uses are supported. It is critical that ancillary supporting services, such as retail, food & beverage and other typical local centre uses can be provided. Potential future development options must be broadened to allow extension of uses beyond traditional and somewhat outdated notions of marine uses.

A bullet point should be added under 3.6.2: To protect and enhance existing suitably located tourism sites and premises to meet the needs of the tourist industry and the local tourism economy.

Should avoid the change of use from tourism facilities to housing. Such changes of use undermine & harm the economies of settlements such as Selsey and East Wittering. New housing must not be at expense of local jobs & the local economy.

Much more emphasis must be given to the provision of enhanced communications generally and reasonable to good speed broadband services. Also Westbourne needs a car park.

Provided that the policies are adhered to. Land identified for employment has already been re-purposed for building. Chichester will have no tourism industry if it is over-developed and, therefore, unattractive. Local employment opportunities also need to be supported by an opportunity to buy affordable homes.

Need to research the District's economic role in relation to the wider area and how it can support neighbouring authorities.

A more flexible approach should be applied to employment-generating uses (include wider uses such as retail, education and care).

Well located sites along transport corridors can release brownfield sites in the city centre for houses.

Question 18: Local plan policies

(a) Do you consider that current Local Plan policies are working to support the aims listed above?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 44 responses Yes – 25

757796; 1104438; 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council); 1103272; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 1104958; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1104753; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 376799; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106566; 1110046; 1110054; 1110135; 1114771 (Genesis Town Planning obo LSquared Property Ltd); 1114793 (Huckleberry Developments); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Comments:

The Housing policy does not help provide jobs etc as not directed at employers and houses will be sold to older people retiring from other areas, and as second homes/buy to let

There is not enough joined up thinking between local planning and District activity.

All employment sites, including strategic employment sites already identified in the current local plan must be protected, and employment options must be supported for these sites. Any demand for existing sites to be used for residential development must be resisted.

Small start homes are required for young people not 4/5bed houses. Affordable homes need to be built where they are needed without having to build unwanted larger houses.

The current Local Plan does not do enough to support the retention of existing tourism sites. Where a site is found not to be viable it should remain in an alternative employment use. This will help prevent the deliberate or unnecessary running down or closure of existing sites, purely with the view to seek a more profitable land value (likely residential).

There is little evidence that the current Local Plan is delivering jobs, save in the construction industry. On the Manhood Peninsula there has been a loss of skilled jobs (Cobham) and the only employment opportunities appear to be in agriculture and tourism. These jobs are usually seasonal and/or part-time and minimum wage.

Every effort is needed to develop the local economy to balance better with the strategic housing policy. Need a local economy which will support the retention of skilled working age residents, and attract young workers to the area rather than allow second/retirement homes with the associated low paid care industry, to take over by default.

The Council should do more to encourage the right type of work.

Policy 26 is not strong enough in protecting existing marine businesses within Chichester Harbour AONB. The statement in paragraph 16.8 should be put into the Policy itself so that this point holds more weight in decision-making.

Developers show little enthusiasm for the proper implementation of Local Plan policies.

Policies require a reference to retaining existing small cheaper units.

The policies should be more forward-looking. Flexibility and understanding of key sectors will be required to ensure ongoing success, for example the fresh food industry in Chichester.

Further residential development is urgently required to significantly contribute to a sustainable economy and to ensure policy aims are met.

Development is being agreed that is not supported by equivalent employment or infrastructure development.

Policy 38 Local and Community Facilities deals only with the loss of facilities, and should offer guidance on proposed facilities as this could help deliver sustainable development.

The economic aims of the plan fail to acknowledge the true value of economic drivers (including heritage and landscape considerations). The plan fails to offer appropriate safeguards to these important business interests and the physical and environmental elements that underpin them, and has not considered the impact of inappropriately sited housing and development upon them.

To enable businesses to respond quickly it would be helpful to give further consideration to the HDA designation by extending the area and creating a wider range of Food Cluster facilities supporting the food industry.

Micro issues affecting single parishes should be examined and incorporated.

Policy 29 relates to the encouragement of proposals for development in Settlement Hubs, but mentions only East Wittering and Selsey specifically. The absence of other Settlement Hubs within the policy wording, serves to potentially restrict employment generating development in these locations, which is contrary to the planning policy aims.

There remain substantial planning hurdles in converting rural buildings into the full range of employment classes.

Question 19: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies should be used to promote economic growth and/or provide for a wider range of employment opportunities?

TOTAL: 21 responses

757796; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council); 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 381100; 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 1104753; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1110000; 1114550 (Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1114823 (Savills UK obo Halls and Woodhouse); 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

New developments target 'social' housing.

Policies should promote flexibility between various employment uses such as classes B1, B2, B8, D1 and D2. This would provide a more diverse and creative approach to employment and services, thus reducing the number of non-viable sites and changes of use from employment generating uses.

The HDA area at Tangmere must be protected for horticultural use, and not allocated for residential housing. It provides an opportunity for employment on land that is grade 1 quality. The Tangmere Straight is a natural boundary to the HDA, and as such no residential use should be allocated to the south of the Tangmere Straight. These should be concentrated in existing employment areas

Planning policies which require proof to demonstrate that an employment site is no longer viable are necessary, and should be extended to all forms of employment, including care homes.

Development should be located where the capacity for employment is the greatest and public transport links and established cycle paths are most efficient.

Account should be taken of marina/boatyard business activity to retain/enhance the range of employment activities.

The biggest deterrents to business moving to Chichester are the poor state of road and rail links. Planning policies alone will not create jobs. New houses should be located near employment centres. The current policies are creating dormitory settlements.

The draft Local Plan should specifically address the development of the rural economy, and should consider small and micro businesses, "green" businesses & improving telecommunications outside larger settlements to successfully compete with those in urban areas.

Large scale glasshouse and solar panel schemes have negative impacts on long distance views. This also includes the nocturnal lighting of rural development.

Need to provide locations where mobile workers can use small offices. We need to encourage our rural communities to find ways that people can work locally in the community.

The A27 Chichester Bypass needs major improvement before more economic growth is promoted.

Proactively and urgently improve broadband speeds and mobile phone connections in rural areas to facilitate employment and home working and economic growth.

The economic aims of the plan are generally sound, although fail to acknowledge the true value of key economic drivers (including heritage and landscape considerations). The plan fails to offer appropriate safeguards to these important business interests and the physical and environmental elements that underpin them, and has not considered the impact of inappropriately sited housing and development upon them.

Ensure there is a wide and flexible choice of sites to come forward for development.

Economic policies should aim to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities through ensuring that natural capital is not degraded. Need to encourage the promotion of green businesses linked to ecosystem services and smart economic growth that embraces the transport hierarchy.

It would be helpful to give further consideration to the HDA designation by extending the area and creating a wider range of Food Cluster facilities supporting the food industry.

A more sympathetic planning approach to small scale live work units and micro business units, possibly built on rural exception sites, under the Community Land Trust umbrella.

The importance of the tourism industry and the economic benefits highlighted in this report has not been fully grasped as part of a defined tourism strategy within the Local Plan.

Employment sites should not be provided in isolation, but rather as part of a mix of uses, for example within a strategic site, in order to achieve a sustainable development to attract and retain business and employees. This would also provide greater certainty over the provision of employment over the plan period.

Question 20: Employment sites

(a) Are there any other sites that you think may be suitable to accommodate business (office and industrial) uses?

(b) Please provide details.

TOTAL: 29 responses Yes – 5

757796; 1104845 (Emary Ltd); 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Ichenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106446; 1110046; 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 973832 (Savills UK obo SUEZ); 1105041; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347

All large housing sites should include employment floorspace and community facilities. Many businesses would like to locate in smaller settlements and the rural area. They should be encouraged to do so, to help local employment and reduce congestion around Chichester.

Former Chichester High School for Boys.

Ham Farm, Broadbridge is an existing employment area identified in the Bosham Neighbourhood Plan. It could form part of a mixed use larger-scale development at Broadbridge or be relocated.

Land to the north of Selsey could provide some employment uses, as part of a comprehensively planned large-scale mixed use development.

Approximately 1 ha of brownfield land at The French Gardens, Broadbridge is available for a limited number of small business/office/hotdesk units and café, together with recreational space to support local housing development.

Some businesses require specific locational considerations. The plan does not make appropriate provision for businesses that have specific locational needs or have sufficient policy safeguards in place to ensure that the importance of such locations are not diminished through the collocation of inappropriate development.

Currently there is no additional employment land allocation in the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Consideration should be given in the Local Plan Review to employment land allocation in Southbourne if any further housing is to be proposed.

It is not possible to suggest suitable locations without more information on the current environmental capacity of the District.

The Vinnetrow Business Park continues to enjoy some spare capacity for growth to include a range of further B1 Units. As the food industry continues to evolve together with the need to provide key worker accommodation, a highly sustainable development opportunity presents itself to combine key worker accommodation with food industry employment development.

Drayton Manor could be considered for predominantly residential, but with some possibility of B1 use. It benefits from strong links to Chichester centre and the Springfield employment scheme and the approved Fuel Depot Site scheme immediately to the south of the railway line, where B2 and B8 uses will be more appropriately focussed.

Land to the east of Southbourne would be an appropriate site to accommodate office and industrial uses, as part of a wider strategic allocation with a mix of other uses.

