

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

Results of Consultation – Main Issues Raised (Questions 31 to 40)

Question 31: Please provide any views on how recent and proposed changes in national policy for housing (e.g. to promote starter homes, self-build homes and community-led housing) should be reflected in the Local Plan Review.

TOTAL: 23 responses

75779; 753618; 755714; 1103272; 1105588; 1105830; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1106446; 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110054; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114922 (Iceni Projects obo Orchaestra Land); 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

General comments:

Affordable housing, particularly in and around the city of Chichester, should be a priority.

Allocate smaller sites for self-build if there is an established need. Community let housing is an excellent idea if there are the skills and resources locally to develop the approach. It would particularly help small scale development to enhance rural communities, and will protect against second homes.

We have no idea how this is reflected in the Local Plan as is.

The Local Plan will need to take account of the proposed changes in the Housing White Paper if they filter through to the NPPF. The broader the definition of affordable housing, the better, whether this is new ways of helping people to buy, starter homes, or building to rent.

The promotion of starter homes/self-build homes should not come at the expense of building more homes to meet the housing need.

Self-build is welcomed, the difficult is the price of the land.

Summarise national policy in the Local Plan Review and set up a National Policy team to enable these types of developments.

Council houses should be built in appropriate locations and never sold on the open market.

Encouragement of Community Land Trusts and self-build is a requirement which policies need to reflect. No differentiation between self and custom build and the values of both.

CDC should consider whether the Plan should either 1) allocate specific parcels of land for self/custom build initiatives; 2) require developments above a certain threshold to contribute towards the provision of serviced plots of land; and 3) provide a criterion-based policy which grants permission for self/custom builds in specific circumstances.

Community led schemes should be given priority. Occasional relaxation of planning regulations to allow community-led affordable housing to be built on rural exception sites should be supported.

There are 66 entries on the Chichester Self-build register indicating a need to identify sites. Land at Four Acres Nursery could go towards meeting this need.

Starter homes, self and custom build housing, later living and homes for disabled people should be reflected in the plan. Policy needs to be justified by evidence, and requirements for self/custom build housing would need to be accompanied by guidance relating to delivery.

Policies around starter homes should include a requirement for onsite GI and biodiversity enhancements. Brownfield land can provide sustainable opportunities, and a minority of brownfield sites are a haven for wildlife. Policies relating to permission in principle and/or the brownfield register must include a mechanism to protect brownfield sites of high environmental value.

The Plan ought to say about type and affordability. There is a need for truly affordable homes for those with local connections. There should be a focus on the provision of public and private rental properties with rents that are affordable in the context of the local income profile, and on the provision of public and private properties for purchase or shared ownership.

Question 32:

(a) Do you agree with the above planning policy aims and strategy for transport and access?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 60 responses Yes - 39

1104014; 757796; 375308 (Tangmere Parish Council); 753618; 1104438; 1104958; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 559554; 755714;

1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105638; 1105830; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 396970; 1102692; 1104753; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106446; 1106566; 1110000; 1110024; 1110046; 1110054; 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); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 557814; 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 558841; 560001; 585871; 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 973832 (Savills obo SUEZ); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114525 (Highways England); 1114550 (Plaistow And Ifold Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally agree, however comments include:

The A27 is critical to the success of the Plan. The policy anticipated an upgrade but this has been shelved aside from very minor junction improvements. Additional development will place further strain on the A27 which will be unsustainable.

Do not close the Oving Lights, they are essential for the villages on this side of the A27 and act as a natural enhancer of traffic flow.

There must be more effort made to reduce the number of vehicles entering Chichester. Park & Ride would be one solution.

There should be flyovers along the A27.

Require adequate parking provision there there is bus/rail interchange to anticipate increased public transport use with increased population.

The policy must be carried out.

The piecemeal approach to transport strategy is not sustainable. The strategy needs a longer term vision, as the economy will struggle without a proper motorway and the rail service needs improving.

Concerns regarding the traffic load on the A27 resulting from Tangmere development and developments in Arun. New housing must come with mitigation and specifically a strategy that allows traffic to avoid the southern bypass to reduce congestion.

The aims are quite different to reality and require implementation.

Welcome the Council's vision to promote a more integrated and sustainable local transport network. Agree that new development should be well-located and designed to minimise the need for travel, and that improvements should be made to junctions on A27 to reduce congestion. Also support targeted investments to improve local transport infrastructure and improved pedestrian and cycling networks.

Should not try to socially engineer people from their cars. Adequate parking provision and safe cycle routes must be included in all new development.

There should be a bypass to the north of the city.

There is insufficient capacity already. The A27 is a key local ring road, not a bypass. Changes to the junctions should not reduce options – locals need access to the city, but also require access onto and off the A27, especially Peninsula residents.

The A27 requires a strategy allowing traffic to avoid the southern bypass. Require an uninterrupted dual carriageway for all through traffic, access into city centre and the Manhood Peninsula.

A review of the A27 east and M27 is required, although outside CDC jurisdiction. Likewise train service improvements are essential.

Infrastructure should be completed prior to development.

CDC needs to be more proactive but needs to think differently. A27 requirements are necessary, and CDC should not ignore the views of the Manhood.

The gross inadequacy of the Fishbourne roundabout should be addressed as a matter of extreme urgency.

The policy says the right things but they have to happen.

The need to promote an integrated and sustainable local transport network is to be supported. However there is no discernible plan for transport that links all the elements and no clear steer as to the direction of travel for integration.

Transport evidence should comply with the NPPF. The evidence needs to ensure that development scenarios provide confidence that package of transport improvements and smarter choice measures are deliverable and likely to provide sufficient mitigation. Need to focus on safe and suitable transport infrastructure.

Policies should recognise the importance and value of access.

Policies require the inclusion of references to electric vehicles, and the need to improve air quality.

The Transport Study that accompanied the current Local Plan was considered flawed because for the purpose of meeting the OAN it did not test scenarios up to 505 dwellings per annum. The Council should ensure that it establishes its OAN first and tests its highway capacity based on this number to establish whether it has capacity and/or what work is required to mitigate any impact.

Require assessment of impacts including those routes linking the southern portion of Chichester to the South Downs. It is difficult for communities close to the two LPA's boundaries to understand the impact and for the National Park Authority to comment. All proposals must have regard to the National Park and its setting, and in doing so must assess the impact on, and take into account, the special qualities of the NP.

CDC must choose innovative strategies focussing on local journeys, air pollution, and the production of sustainable transport options.

Greater onus must be on improving bus services to/from the more rural parishes.

Sites at S1 and Drayton Manor are easily connected to the city via footpaths and bus and cycle routes, ensuring reduced use of cars into the city.

Should consider major new public transport development as part of a long term solution, e.g. build homes along a railway line to justify a new station.

Take into account other plans, for example Southern Gateway and A27 improvements.

Transport should be considered alongside strategic sites, and the Council should consider future needs.

Pleased that the Plan stresses the importance that new developments are supported by infrastructure improvements. Highways England are concerned about the impacts of unspecified additional housing/employment sites on the A27 and how these are dealt with. The assignment of trips onto the A27 should remain appropriate and any increase above LP allocation is considered and re-assigned. Proposed mitigation needs to be re-evaluated and agreed, viable and deliverable, and considered being capable of being funded.

Priorities should be: to provide hard infrastructure to support bus services; access to rail stations; walking/cycle routes separated from main carriageways. Lesser priorities given to: behavioural change/smart choice measures.

Review parking requirements given the increase in vehicles per household and home basing of work vehicles. A minimum of 5.5 metre wide estate roads are required to allow large vehicles to pass parked cars/vans freely and minimise pavement parking.

Question 33: 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: 40 responses Yes - 18

757796; 1103272; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 1102692; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1110000; 375067 (British Horse Society); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110046; 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 1105041; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347

General comments:

More might be achieved with Park & Ride and use of canal (commuter water taxi?).

Planning policy should provide safe, supervised places to park bicycles near leisure, retail and public transport facilities.

The policies don't go far enough. There is a deficit in infrastructure to support sustainable travel that needs to be addressed alongside mitigation measures.

The Local Plan can't work until the A27 has been sorted. The improvements must include: improvements to the existing route, an uninterrupted dual carriageway for all through traffic, and adequate access to Chichester or the Manhood Peninsula.

Policy 8 - "All road users" should include equestrians. To improve safety, this wording should change to "improved pedestrian, cycling and equestrian (multi-use) networks (where appropriate).

Policy 39 – should include the commitment to "create multi-use links between new development and existing recreational routes including multi-use public rights of way".

Policy 16 – provision of graded separated crossing at Coach Road would be of benefit. As the proposed bridge caters for walkers/cyclists only,

should view to make available for equestrians.

Bridleways should be provided as part of green infrastructure.

Transport evidence should comply with the NPPF. The evidence needs to ensure that development scenarios provide confidence that package of transport improvements and smarter choice measures are deliverable and likely to provide sufficient mitigation. Need to focus on safe and suitable transport infrastructure.

If the desire/vision is for development that minimises the impact on existing roads then development should be built as close as possible to existing transport hubs.

Should consider major new public transport development as part of a long term solution, e.g. build homes along a railway line to justify a new station.

The government must assist with the aims.

The Transport Study that accompanied the current Local Plan was considered flawed because for the purpose of meeting the OAN it did not test scenarios up to 505 dwellings per annum. This undermined the soundness of the Local Plan housing policies, and the transport policies in the current LP have failed to address ongoing issues of congestion or to provide proper transport infrastructure to deliver development.

The plan should set out objectives for transport and communication, and these should primary considerations in the location of development.

There is no evidence of better integration between bus/train services in rural areas. There has been only slow improvement in broadband and telecommunications in rural areas.

Development should fund implementation. The current roof tax on the A27 would be better spent on local transport projects.

The Authority Monitoring Report 2015/16 indicates there is a substantial issue with air quality, and it is not clear what wider improvements to local transport and accessibility have been made through CIL contributions.

Policy 8 and 39 are the principle policies. Both are considered to support the aims.

The A27 debacle resulted from decision making and poor leadership by the District/County Councils. Given the failure of the investment in the upgrade, further allocations for additional housing/employment land causes great concern. The current infrastructure does not have capacity.

The piecemeal approach to transport strategy is not sustainable. The strategy needs a longer term vision, as the economy will struggle without a proper motorway and the rail service needs improving.

Question 34: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies could be better used to improve access to services and facilities, reduce traffic and promote sustainable transport?

TOTAL: 27 responses

753618; 755714; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 383360 (Chichester Society); 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 381100; 1102692; 1105019 (Intelligent Land obo Landlink Estates); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1106446; 1110000; 1110046; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110054; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114525 (Highways England); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

General comments:

Development should be focussed on settlements which are important public transport hubs and are close to main A roads and services.

Policies should give greater priority to the delivery of, and developer contributions to, cycle tracks linking developments to facilities.

Policies should reflect the commercial nature of public transport and take into account where bus service providers will find it commercially viable to extend existing services, or provide new ones.

Encourage electric (and PHEV) cars, with preferential parking and routes.

Chichester needs a park and ride facility, with low cost and efficient bus services.

Bus routes should be identified and re-routed to serve major developments.

Build the A27 Chichester northern bypass.

Close the inner lane of the Fishbourne roundabout.

Transport evidence should comply with the NPPF. The evidence needs to ensure that development scenarios provide confidence that package of transport improvements and smarter choice measures are deliverable and likely to provide sufficient mitigation. Need to focus on safe and suitable transport infrastructure.

CDC should prioritise these aims over others or allow sites that achieve these objectives even if they fell down in other areas.

It should not be possible a development to suggest it is “sustainable” because it is situated physically close to the city. It is inevitable that new development will lead to an increase in car numbers/journeys, and sites should be identified where the existing network has capacity or the capacity can be increased or mitigated by measures implemented at the same time as the development.

Suggest: concentrate on encouraging non-car dependence businesses to develop and flourish; and requiring large developments to be accompanied by a travel plan which could include measures such as incentivising car sharing and car clubs.

Policies must focus on embedding the sustainable transport hierarchy into development.

Ensure new development has more off-road parking than the current guidance recommends, therefore keeping the roads clear and allowing for the free movement of traffic. Improve car parking in the service villages so that residents will be more inclined to access facilities locally.

Improve pedestrian access to the station, as well as cycle access and bike storage.

Locate significant development along the railway line which will give residents easy access to trains promoting modal shift. A new settlement along a railway line would justify the construction of a new station as part of a long term solution.

The review should take into account other plans, including Southern Gateway and A27 improvements.

Large-scale strategic sites, such as at the Land to the east of Southbourne, have the opportunity to provide significant infrastructure improvements and therefore a site-specific policy to include provision of improvements.

Southern Rail problems must be brought to an end.

Get on with it.

Build on inner city car parks and create an out of town park and ride.

There may be a need to revisit the SPD “Approach for securing development contributions to mitigate additional traffic impacts on the A27

Chichester Bypass” to ensure that any additional improvements required are fully funded and fairly apportioned.

Question 35: The Environment

(a) Do you agree with the above planning policy aims for the environment?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 67 responses Yes – 55

1104014; 757796; 753618; 1104438; 1104958; 375108; 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1105830; 1106023; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green); 381100; 396970; 1102692; 1104753; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106327; 1106336; 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1106566; 1110000; 1110046; 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 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); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 1058144 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1105041; 1106044; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106446; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106486 (Natural England); 1110054; 1110135; 1113893; 1113894; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plastow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114754 (Berkeley Strategic Group); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 558922; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 973832 (Savills UK obo SUEZ); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Broadly agree, but comments include:

The policy should robustly discourage development of sites important for wildlife which may not be protected under the listed environmental designations. Protected species should also be surveyed to ensure preservation of their natural habitats.

You cannot protect and enhance the landscape character of the countryside by building houses on every scrap of space left.

Coastal areas at risk of flood and erosion should be excluded from development (including Selsey, Wittering and Oving).

The function of a coastal flood plain needs to be fully recognised. The area is unique in that it includes Chichester Harbour, Pagham, Medmerry, a canal and the least developed coastal hinterland in the south east of England. CDC needs to protect this rare and fragile environment and mitigate against climate change related flooding.

The remaining protective gravel aquifer around Oving/Tangmere should be preserved to avoid further flood risk.

Support the following aims: provide/enhance GI; protect/enhance priority habitats, ecological networks and biodiversity; preserve and enhance designate sites; protect water quality and avoid increasing flood risk; use natural resources prudently; minimise waste and pollution; mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

A lot of things that should be done in policy are only allowed to be done within building regulations, and developers can utilise private building regulation companies which stop the planning authority to have a greater say on things like energy efficiency.

Air quality issues need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

There needs to be stronger protection for hedgerows, ditches, watercourses, minor waterways and other habitats.

Strongly support specific mention of locally designated sites as they are important components in the district's ecological network. Would like to see specific commitment to protection of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland. There should be a specific requirement for development to achieve net gains to biodiversity.

CDC should seek to protect the designated sites and historic environment by locating development in the least constrained areas. The Council will need to balance the objectives of meeting the full housing need with locating development in sustainable locations.

There should no/very little development within designated sites such as the AONB.

It is important to stress the need to preserve the openness of the views in, to and around the AONB and SDNP.

Need to reduce light pollution in the AONB, particularly to protect bats.

Bosham needs more protection and the AONB should be expanded.

Potential sites should not be discounted on the basis of their presence in principle within such designations not least as the effect on the AONB may be marginal.

Conserve and enhance the character of protected landscapes. Policies should be included to ensure developments close to the boundaries of protected landscapes take proper account of the impacts on the NP/AONB. Policies should also set out that any proposal that adversely affects a European site or causes significant harm to an SSSI will not normally be granted permission. The plan should aim to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.

It is important to fully consider sites outside of SPAs/NPs to accommodate the needs for housing and employment sites.

The strategic large-scale development proposals contradict the policy aims.

Need to maintain distinctive local landscape character and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land between settlements, and sensitively develop poorer quality agricultural land.

Must insist that all new developments are of the highest environmental quality.

Agree with the aims for the environment and they are echoed within the proposed development for the site Oving Park. This land has been restored to agricultural land is now of poor quality, so there will be no significant environmental effects.

Question 36: 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: 42 responses Yes – 27

757796; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 1106023; 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 1102692; 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1106486 (Natural England); 1106566; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1109978; 1109979; 1110000; 1110046; 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347

Generally agree, but comments include:

There is too much development in and close to the AONB.

The policy deals with pressures on wastewater treatment, but could be stronger on water quality protection, there is little reference to development of potentially contaminated sites.

Consider that the site at Oving Park, which is within strategic site S1, is not restrained by environmental factors and the site does not have any other designations that would limit the development potential.

The policies have been successful in part.

Biodiversity studies that are paid for by the developer may be inadequate. Areas of biodiversity could be lost due to limited checks on the quality of submitted reports.

Need additional protection for local habitats not currently designated.

Natural England supports the environmental policies. It is necessary to update policies 50 and 51; policy 43 should be retained. The recently adopted SPD should help to strengthen LP policy 43 and is welcomed.

Need to ensure any large tree planting schemes within and adjacent to new development take into account the eventual full growth of those trees so they do not become subject to removal due to impact on housing, services or resident's preferences. Onward maintenance and protection of landscape buffers requires greater policy cover.

Housing development should be directed towards areas with fewer constraints. There should be an adequate allocation of housing sites to meet the District's needs, which will have the benefit of reducing the pressure of speculative applications in areas of sensitivity.

Monitoring indicators are not sufficient to assess if developments are achieving net gains to biodiversity, or whether the district's natural capital is being eroded.

The policies are being overridden by builders and CDC allowing the building of large estates on farmland.

Need to address needs of equestrians as at present there is no other option but to use roads which are unpleasant and unsafe.

There is no mention of creating new fields or keeping land for arable and farming needs. Need to be able to feed our country.

CDC should adhere to their policies in the decision-making process. All councillors should receive regular training and updates on policies.

The aims do not embrace the NPPF's requirements to look for solutions rather than problems, and the opportunity to link development with infrastructure improvements is missing.

Should identify and designate areas that should be kept free from development, including buffer areas. Unless protected appropriately, land on the edge of the city, which is vital to its setting, character and heritage value, will be lost.

There have been repeated reports of the unauthorised removal and destruction of ancient hedgerows, important wildlife habitats and bat corridors, but no action has been taken to date.

It is important that wider policies within the Plan do not restrict development in locations outside of designated areas or in areas of lower landscape value.

If neighbourhoods were designed around car-sharing/car-club schemes, we would need fewer parking spaces. If designed into a project from the start, there would be sufficient critical mass to make schemes viable. New housing should be required to meet environmental standards and should mandate electrical car charging points. Public transport needs greater provision.

Consideration should be given to the Lead Local Flood Authority Policy for the Management of Surface Water in review of policy 42.

Blue infrastructure could be recognised and promoted throughout the plan.

More could be done by setting targets through monitoring and benchmarking activities, net gains and hierarchy of levels of protection need to be clearly defined in policy.

AONB policy does not refer to the tests required by the NPPF.

Question 37: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies could be better used to protect and enhance the environment?

TOTAL: 35 responses

1103023; 757796; 753618; 755714; 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375337 (Environment Agency); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1110000; 1110046; 375142 (Historic England); 375149 (West Sussex Local Access Forum); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 743931 (South Downs National Park Authority); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106407; 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1109979; 1110014; 1110135; 1110173; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

General comments:

“Green corridors” avoid urban noise and pollution and provide easy access to the countryside.

Green spaces should be reserved and incorporated into housing developments.

Should have variable density requirements for development, dependent on how urban/rural the location is, and the need for drainage/SuDS.

Enhance the policy to use CIL to mitigate against wildlife disturbance, e.g. more dog bins and wardens is not sufficient. Habitat creation is more appropriate and a lasting response.

Build only what is needed.

Respect local plans.

Greater weight should be given to the NPPF para 115 that sets out the protection of the AONB.

Properties built with environmental-saving measures which will make them cheaper to run and reduce emissions and may support local businesses in sustainable energy sector. Could allocate business land for this type and encourage colleges to provide courses Green insulation roofs.

Require wide pavements to enable planting and include trees within carparks.

Encourage low-car developments or car-sharing, home working, self-build.

The protection of SSSIs, AONBs and SPAs is important and should remain so.

If neighbourhoods were designed around car-sharing/car-club schemes, we would need fewer parking spaces. If designed into a project from the start, there would be sufficient critical mass to make schemes viable. New housing should be required to meet environmental standards and should mandate electrical car charging points. Public transport needs greater provision.

Southern Water need to improve the raw sewage handling from Chidham, Hambrook and Nutbourne East Parish Council area.

Consideration should be given to the Lead Local Flood Authority Policy for the Management of Surface Water in review of policy 42.

Blue infrastructure could be recognised and promoted throughout the plan.

More could be done by setting targets through monitoring and benchmarking activities, net gains and hierarchy of levels of protection need to be clearly defined in policy.

Review the AONB designation.

By adopting a proactive role for development, the environment can be protected.

Improve Policy 47 in accordance with Historic England's advice.

The production of detailed landscape evidence is highly recommended. The potential development capacity of sites should be informed by this evidence, which will enable CDC to generate a more landscape sensitive development strategy.

Reconsider the strategic allocation NE of the city. This should be open space and should be safeguarded from development to enhance the character of city and protect the countryside. Should generate a new strategic baseline taking into account physical capacity, environmental and economic restrictions.

Encourage soft and rural features, e.g. hedges rather than fences.

The plan should specify bridleways as there is a current lack in the area. There should be safe, off-road access for horse riders as equestrians bring a great deal to the local economy. Many rural areas do not have pavements, so perhaps footpaths and bridleways should be combined. New housing areas should provide linked up multi-user tracks. New developments should consider the needs of the area and accommodate them.

More emphasis on walking/cycling as a leisure activity, and more recognition of PROWs.

Ensure all members of Planning Committee are familiar with, and adhere to the NPPF and Local Plan in decision-making.

Provide resources so that breaches are properly investigated and policed.

Strategic development sites have the opportunity to enhance the environment through provision of SANG and green infrastructure. The provision of these benefits not only enhances the environment, but can increase accessibility to the countryside for current and future residents. The Plan Review should consider the opportunities and benefits that strategic development can provide to enhance the environment, alongside

the wider protection policies for designated areas.

Inclusion of policy on trees and woodland and include protection to ancient woodland and the requirement to maintain 15m buffer of semi natural habitat with ancient woodland.

Biodiversity policy - include requirement for applications to be based upon up-to-date ecological information. Mapping of natural capital and ecosystem services is still an emerging process, but great advances have been made in a short time.

Need to consider habitat creation and natural flood management opportunities.

Double counting of SuDS attenuation/storage ponds and landscape buffers as open space should not be allowed.

The calculation for population increase from new development needs revision, as a district-wide average is not appropriate for strategic developments in East-West corridor where second/holiday homes form a much lower proportion of total stock than elsewhere. The current calculation rate is lower than WSCC.

Question 38: Local Green Space

(a) Should the Local Plan Review identify and designate Local Green Spaces?

(b) Please provide details of any special local areas that you think should be designated as Local Green Spaces

TOTAL: 43 responses Yes – 32

757796; 1104438; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 381100; 1102692; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106486 (Natural England); 1106566; 1110000; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estate Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110046; 1110054; 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1115333; 1115347; 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally agree; comments include:

All green spaces within Chichester walls should be preserved.

Within all significant housing developments.

Green spaces separating villages previously referred to as strategic gaps are being eroded and should be protected whether through LGS designation, or through a gap designation.

This should not be restricted to publicly owned land, as there are small areas of rare biodiversity in private ownership e.g. the old orchard that lies east of Cot Lane and south of Main Road, Chidham.

Natural England welcomes the use of designation where sites are identified for natural environment reasons.

Yes, in conjunction with neighbourhood plans; require joint working.

Local designations that have been subject to appropriate consultation and support should be included. The designations must be evidence based and subject to the full local plan process to withstand challenge. These designations are important if the district's sustainability, environment, health and well-being are to be preserved.

Suggested sites:

Local Green Spaces and Local Gaps have been specified in the submission version of the Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan.

Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Green Ring Policy 3 and Proposal 2.

Maybush Copse, Chidham

The Dell, Chidham

Hawthorne Meadow, Hambrook

Pinewood Meadow, Hambrook

Pynham Meadow, Hambrook

Shopwyke

Fishbourne Meadows

Itchenor Pond

Question 39: Health and Wellbeing

(a) Do you agree with the above planning policy aims for health and wellbeing?

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 36 responses Yes – 30

757796; 1103272; 375108; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106486 (Natural England); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 557814; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1110046; 1110054; 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally yes, but comments include:

Consider adding access to informal enjoyment of coast and countryside (walking, cycling, kayaking, rowing, sailing etc) – activities which may not require facilities as such but require better access.

Need to recognise differing age groups in villages.

The focus on green open space and playing fields are an appropriate way to meet aims and objectives to ensure residents are healthy. Any development of the Oving Park site would include sufficient open space for residents, with improved access and cycle routes.

Natural England welcomes the reference to the importance of open space, particularly greenspace, for health and wellbeing.

More investment is required.

Shopwyke would like its post box back.

Need to better identify where there is a shortfall in open space, sport and recreation facilities, and assist communities with provision.

Agree with the aims for health and wellbeing.

Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Green Ring Policy 3.

Support the retention of criterion 3 in policy 54. Enhancements to the environment can be facilitated through the creation of multi-functional open space, which should be in line with an up-to-date GI strategy.

Would like to see additional wording in policy 55, criterion 4: "it does not result in the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land or adversely impact on biodiversity and the functioning of the wider landscape".

Question 40: 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: 33 responses Yes – 18

757796; 1103272; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106023; 375067 (British Horse Society); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 1105637 (Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106566; 1110000; 1110046; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375349 (Sport England); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 557814; 558922; 560001; 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114550 (Plaiستow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 558841; 585871; 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates)

General comments include:

Large housing developments mean many more cars and more pollution, plus congestion and delays.

The policies are fine, but they need to be enacted, for example in the provision of cycle routes.

At the SDNPA inquiry, the fields of Whitehouse farm were commended by the Inspector as "of high scenic quality, containing mosaic of woodland...and pasture...that provide important open-air recreational opportunities". Centurion Way was seen as a potentially important green link into the Park. The housing imposed on it fails to retain, enhance and increase the quantity/quality of open space and recreational facilities and fails to "improve access" except for the car.

Further action and more investment is required.

Double counting of SuDS attenuation/storage ponds and landscape buffers as open space should not be allowed.

The calculation for population increase from new development needs revision, as a district-wide average is not appropriate for strategic developments in East-West corridor where second/holiday homes form a much lower proportion of total stock than elsewhere. The current calculation rate is lower than WSCC.

Residential development in the area would improve housing supply, which would improve health and wellbeing, given links between quality of life and access to adequate choice of good quality housing. Developments will include cycle links and pedestrian routes to encourage a healthy lifestyle, along with access to outdoor amenity space. Oving Park could meet these aims in line with the related policies.

Where a number of developments are taking place, open space provision should be masterplanned.

There is a shortfall in provision in Ifold, and this is not identified in the Local Plan nor is there the means to address this.

The policies are appropriate to support the aims. The provisions with regard to the loss of open space, sport and recreation facilities are appropriate in order to not restrict development. The link between increasing facilities and development is not spelt out. This should be adopted in the master or concept plan approach.

Identify and introduce more recreation areas to match development and community needs.

Incorporate a policy on built environments and health and fast food outlets. The “Spatial Planning for Health – an evidence resource for planning and designing healthier places” paper should be considered when planning for healthier places.

The line “exceptions will only be made where the benefit of development outweighs any harm, and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available” is not considered to comply with the NPPF, which does not have this caveat regarding exceptions.

Good cycle route network, safe areas for children where they can be nurtured by the natural environment, and green outdoor gyms.

Policy 54 – include a bullet point to mention PROWs and multi-use recreational routes.

Policy 55 – the wording in bullet point 8 would be difficult to comply with on the Manhood Peninsula. This adds weight to the need for any newly created PROW or recreational route to be multi-use.