

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

Results of Consultation – Main Issues Raised (Questions 41 to 45)

Question 41: Do you have any views or suggestions for how planning policies could be better used to promote health and wellbeing?

TOTAL: 18 responses

757796; 753618; 383360 (Chichester Society); 755714; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 375349 (Sport England); 381100; 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106566; 1110046; 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1114938 (Barton Willmore)

General comments:

Limit car use in urban areas.

The A27 situation needs to be resolved without the use of flyovers or concentrating traffic to the south or west of the city, where prevailing winds carry pollution to the most densely populated area of the District. Policies should take the prevailing wind and traffic-related air quality into account when identifying strategic sites. A diversionary relief road is needed to prevent regular gridlock.

More, and improved, public transport, cycling and walking links. Footways and cycleways should be direct and safe and attractively featured.

More encouragement and protection for greenery and rural features, particularly to resist the loss of hedges.

Well-being is enhanced by a sense of belonging to local communities consisting of smaller housing developments growing organically around existing settlements. Smaller settlements invite participation and reduce the risk of social isolation.

Transport plans should be provided to minimise travel times.

There should be a better matching of supply and demand.

The Council should support the acquisition of land by parish councils or other bodies for coordinated provision of open space.

The Council should continue to complete the Playing Pitch Strategy work, and revise the policy in the Local Plan accordingly to reflect the findings, and adopt a site-specific approach rather than the use of standards for sport.

Housing in rural areas with no facilities and limited transport, as well as limited local employment, does not promote health and wellbeing.

Policies should refer to natural capital and ecosystem services. It is vital that CDC create a GI strategy against which applications can be assessed. CDC should use evidence of need to base informed decisions of where GI resources should be focussed, including considering priorities in the SDNPA GI Framework. This strategic approach must be developed before policy changes are made.

Incorporate a policy on built environments and health and fast food outlets. WSCC considers that the recently published “Spatial Planning for Health – an evidence resource for planning and designing healthier places” should be considered.

Emphasise the link between increasing facilities and development. This should be adopted in masterplan approach. Larger developments should be required to provide play and recreational space in the centre of the scheme.

New development can facilitate pedestrian and cycle paths, as well as GI such as trim trails, which can provide significant health benefits. Strategic development can provide education and primary healthcare facilities which are integral to the health and wellbeing and the sustainability of a community.

Question 42: Infrastructure Provision

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

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 65 responses Yes – 42

1104014; 1104136 (Bosham Association); 753618; 757796; 1104438; 1104724 (Havant Borough Council); 375108; 375337 (Environment Agency); 383360 (Chichester Society); 746653; 755714; 1103272; 1105374; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375260 (Bosham Parish Council); 375261 (Boxgrove Parish Council); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375318 (Wisborough Green Parish Council); 381100; 559554; 856633 (Theatres Trust); 1021645; 1102692; 1104753; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1106336; 1109813; 1110000; 375125 (Chichester Harbour Conservancy); 375129 (Savills UK obo Thames Water); 375130 (Southern Water); 375142 (Historic England); 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estates Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 376056 (West Sussex County Council); 376799; 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 756580 (Sigma Planning Services obo Rydon Homes); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge

Estates); 878413 (Thakeham Homes); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110024; 1110046; 1110054; 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 1115333; 1115347; 755602 (Savills UK obo Bloor Homes Southern); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 973832 (Savills UK obo SUEZ); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

Generally yes, but comments include:

Infrastructure required by any development should be provided prior to that development being operational.

Multifunctional facilities should only be used when appropriate. There can be conflict between different interests and then it is better to provide dedicated separate facilities.

Remove the reference to “maximise contributions”, and replace with “should seek to avoid reduction or minimisation of appropriate financial contributions unless supported by proper viability evidence”.

The need to provide new infrastructure as appropriate and to coordinate phasing of new development should be a policy.

There are a number of infrastructure constraints which need to be confirmed. The Council should proactively engage with developers and other local stakeholders in the progression of large scale infrastructure projects to ensure a coordinated response supported by a robust evidence base.

Housing construction without appropriate infrastructure will damage both existing and future residential areas.

Planning policies must be adhered to. Without infrastructure that is fit for purpose, any planning, however well-intentioned, will fail.

The criterion for this review had been the current lack of infrastructure to support a higher number of houses. Nothing has changed and there has been no improvement to the infrastructure, therefore it is questioned why the review is necessary.

Unrestricted/unlimited windfall development has no mechanism by which adverse impacts on infrastructure, or lack of infrastructure, can be addressed.

Phase large-scale and strategic development alongside the necessary infrastructure in order to ensure sites and infrastructure are delivered.

Local government should use its size and historically low borrowing rates to invest in infrastructure for new developments as well as existing

communities.

Co-location and multifunctional use of facilities is a minor contribution to a huge problem. It is better to build a larger strategic site with new infrastructure and services than trying to stretch existing facilities.

The Council needs to liaise with other district councils and the County Council for the planning and provision of new infrastructure. Need to focus in particular on development in Havant borough and impact on neighbouring settlements in Chichester area.

There is inadequate wastewater treatment infrastructure on the Manhood Peninsula; the pipework is particularly poor.

There is a deficit in the area of decent infrastructure, which does not get addressed by new development as it only mitigates for its increase. A complete plan of how to address the shortfall before new development takes place is required. All infrastructure requirements should be considered ahead of any proposal irrespective of the size of the development.

Some areas have had large scale development (over 100 homes) with no increase in infrastructure.

Support Policy CP25 which must be carried forward. Support Policy 42 in principle but this could be improved. There should be a separate policy for Water Supply and Sewerage/Wastewater Infrastructure.

Development should mitigate impacts on existing infrastructure and continue to contribute to mitigate increases in recreational disturbance (Policy 50). Large scale developments have the advantage of justifying greater provision and therefore are preferable.

Support the requirement to improve/restore/enhance or create additional PROW provision (Policy 52) as well as the criterion regarding the dissection of routes across and beyond the Plan area. Off-road equestrian opportunities are sought after, particularly but not exclusively on the Manhood Peninsula, and to cross major roads (A27, A259, A272, A285, A286).

Dual counting of educational facilities for community use to reduce separate community/open space provision requirements should be avoided. Education requirements change over time and are incompatible with community use. S106 agreements and conditions should have "tight" wording.

Policy references to infrastructure must include reference to green infrastructure.

A long-term solution for the A27 is required. Altering junctions will not solve the problem or allow for growth. CDC must tell HE/Treasury that the District cannot absorb more housing without a commitment to a fully-integrated transport system encompassing multimodal public transport, a district-wide cycle network, a proper bypass and a ringroad.

Planning should address drainage and flood risk.

A transport interchange (train/bus/taxi) should be provided at Chichester station, along with park and ride facilities.

Local infrastructure is not suitable for development on the scale proposed.

Retain Policy 38 regarding protection and enhancement of existing community and cultural facilities.

The following aims should be addressed: planning policies should explicitly encourage and support delivery of utility infrastructure. Should any site specific local infrastructure capacity constraints be identified, policies should seek to facilitate direct agreements with service providers. Policies should ensure development is coordinated with the provision of new infrastructure.

The strategy will only be successful if supported by appropriate infrastructure. The Local Plan must place greater emphasis on developers to provide that sufficient infrastructure exists, and it should not be left to others to provide once a development is completed.

Question 43: Local Plan policies

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

(b) Please provide any further comments.

TOTAL: 38 responses Yes – 20

757796; 1101476 (Education and Skills Funding Agency); 375108; 375129 (Savills UK obo Thames Water Utilities); 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315 (West Itchenor Parish Council); 375337 (Environment Agency); 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1109951; 1110000; 375162 (WYG obo Seaward Properties); 375199 (HMPC Ltd obo Goodwood Estates Company Ltd); 375263 (Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council); 375303 (Southbourne Parish Council); 389541 (Loxwood Society); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 1105041; 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1110046; 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114550 (Plaiستow & Ifold Parish Council); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1115333; 557814; 558841; 558922; 560001; 585871; 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1115347

General comments:

Suggest that wording is amended to reflect that development should mitigate its impact, for example where it would generate the need for a

new school, the developer should pay. Should explicitly refer to new school places or safeguard land plus land for extensions. Produce a Planning for Schools background paper.

Park & Ride is ignored as an option

The policies should be adhered to.

Discussions in relation to the Water Cycle Study and, in particular, the provision of wastewater infrastructure may inform this policy further.

Some areas have already had substantial new development with no infrastructure improvements over the last 10 years.

No because the expected new convenience shop at the Chidham Place development did not get delivered and it was taken by a charity shop. The area has a great need for a convenience shop and no need for a charity shop.

The provision of existing infrastructure should be part of the baseline evidence described above, upon which the development strategy should be founded. The plan should set out a process ensuring the provision of infrastructure is coordinated and not left to ad hoc consideration on a site by site basis.

In Parishes where there is a made Neighbourhood Plan, Parish Councils should be consulted in the drafting of S106 agreements.

Often it is unclear precisely how and when financial contributions are to be used and for what purpose.

The phasing of new development is not being properly coordinated with the delivery of infrastructure, facilities and services. Detailed plans must be completed and in place before first occupation.

There have been too many decisions taken at odds with the Local Plan policies and the NPPF.

The opportunity to produce mixed use development that embraces community needs and facilities is not being driven by the Council.

Small-scale residential and windfall development is not being fed through to infrastructure provision, foul and surface water drainage, local schools and medical facilities.

Local government should use its size and historically low borrowing rates to invest in infrastructure for new developments as well as existing communities.

The policy anticipated an upgrade to the A27 however the District and County Councils reversed their decision to support option 2 in the recent Highways England consultation. This contributed to the loss of any imminent A27 upgrade other than very minor junction improvements, which renders additional development unsuitable.

Co-location and multifunctional use of facilities is a minor contribution to a huge problem. It is better to build a larger strategic site with new infrastructure and services than trying to stretch existing facilities.

There is a deficit in the area of decent infrastructure, which does not get addressed by new development as it only mitigates for its increase. A complete plan of how to address the shortfall before new development takes place is required. All infrastructure requirements should be considered ahead of any proposal irrespective of the size of the development.

Infrastructure issues and requirements should be considered ahead of any proposal for housing developments irrespective of the size of the development.

Question 44: Do you have any views or suggestions for how the planning, phasing and delivery of infrastructure could be improved?

TOTAL: 35 responses

757796; 1104438; 755714; 1101476 (Education and Skills Funding Agency); 1103272; 1105588 (Oving Parish Community Watch); 375315; 375318; 381100; 383360 (Chichester Society); 1102692; 1106023; 1106172 (Oving Parish Council); 1110000; 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); 781202 (Sussex Wildlife Trust); 1106099 (Westbourne Parish Council); 1106452 (West Wittering Parish Council); 1106519 (Gleeson Strategic Land); 1110046; 1110054; 1110135; 1114489 (Chichester Liberal Democrats); 1114807 (WYG obo Metis Homes); 1114938 (Barton Willmore); 558534 (Luken Beck obo Hanbury Properties); 653668 (Luken Beck obo Barratt Homes); 790970 (Luken Beck obo Kingsbridge Estates); 805751 (Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates); 1115662 (Hague Farms)

General comments:

Coordinate with health services for more doctors; coordinate with sewage treatment for extensions; coordinate with local employers to ascertain whether housing is difficult for staff; conduct air quality checks to reduce traffic density.

The Local Plan must require all infrastructure to be in place before housing development.

Developers should be held to account.

The provision of existing infrastructure should be part of the baseline evidence upon which the development strategy should be founded. The plan should set out a process ensuring the provision of infrastructure is coordinated and not left to ad hoc consideration on a site by site basis.

Parish Councils should be significantly involved in the process of delivering infrastructure. Processes should be put in place which legally bind all stakeholders to any agreement. Much of the delivery of infrastructure projects is being passed down to parishes as part of localism but without any preparation by District or County Councils.

Need to consider all of the alternatives regardless of cost; for example, the A27 bypass could be in a cutting a tunnel taking the northern route.

The A27 improvement should be designed, agreed, financed and started before more housing, than already planned, is permitted.

Developers should have to complete social building, community/infrastructure payments and any transfers of land before being permitted to sell private housing.

Infrastructure payments should be triggered much earlier in the development process to guarantee delivery well before the development is completed, thus enabling public and private sector improvements to keep pace.

Local government should use its size and historically low borrowing rates to invest in infrastructure for new developments as well as existing communities.

Identify and develop inner city brownfield sites and keep the character of the South Downs villages by listening to local knowledge.

If large-scale development is planned for Drayton/Oving and/or Bersted in Arun, then may need to consider improvements to A259 before development starts.

The next Local Plan should identify specific sites which can deliver need. Policy/allocations should be as specific as possible including location/accessibility/type/size of school.

Consider minerals infrastructure.

LPAs should set out a strategic approach to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure. CDC should use evidence of need to base informed decisions on where GI resources should be focused, including considering priorities in the SDNP GI

Framework. This approach must be developed before policy changes are made. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan must include GI.

The infrastructure deficiencies should be addressed so that they do not prevent otherwise suitable development sites from coming forward. For example, the Apuldram Wastewater Treatment Works needs to be upgraded as a priority.

A close partnership between the LPA and developers needs to be fostered so that developers can carry out certain infrastructure works in association with their own developments. This will also provide certainty over development, forward fund where appropriate and assist with applications for grants or loans to enable infrastructure to be delivered at the earliest opportunity.

Require the referencing location of fibre enabled cabinets in terms of new developments.

Developers should provide detailed infrastructure planning, phasing and delivery as part of the application.

Question 45: Document uploads

All documents submitted as part of representations to the consultation are available to view on the consultation website, **under Question 45:** <http://chichester.limehouse.co.uk/portal/lpr/lprio/lprio?pointId=s14963112046851#section-s14963112046851>

Sites promoted:

Site	Promoter	Proposal
Land between Southbourne and Hambrook, Park North Road (Former Phoenix Works)	Barton Willmore	Circa 2000 dwellings, employment and mixed use, education, station/park and ride
Land to the south of B2179 and west of Bell Lane, Birdham	Barton Willmore obo Martin Grant Homes	59 – 89 dwellings
Chichester Marina	CBRE obo Premier Marinas	Non-strategic development
Land east of R-RMC Plant	David Lock Associates obo Rolls Royce	Strategic employment site
Land south of Clay Lane, Chichester	Neame Sutton obo Crayfern Homes	25 dwellings
Land at Bramber Plant Centre	Genesis obo Mr J Ferguson	22 dwellings
Land west of Blackboy Lane, Fishbourne	Iceni obo Fishbourne Developments	500+ dwellings
Land at Four Acre Nursery, Cooks Lane, Southbourne	Iceni obo Orchaestra Land	45 dwellings (possibly self or custom build)
Land to the rear of Sturt Avenue	Casa Coevo	10 dwellings

Land north of Southbourne	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	450+ dwellings
Land south of Tangmere	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	“substantial number of dwellings”
Land south of Meadow Close, Hunston	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	90 dwellings
Land east of Westbourne	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	150 dwellings
Land east of Drayton Lane	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	900 dwellings
Land at Birdham	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	“limited development”
Land west of Oving	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	Small scale development
Land at Marsh Lane, Chidham	Lichfields obo Church Commissioners	Limited development
Land off Alfrey Close/ Main Street, Southbourne	LRM Planning obo Hallam Land	123 dwellings
Stubcroft Farm, East Wittering	Luken Beck obo Barratt David Wilson Homes	“Garden Neighbourhood” – circa 800 dwellings
Highgrove Farm, Broadbridge	Luken Beck obo Barratt David Wilson Homes	250 dwellings plus facilities
South Downs Holiday Park, Bracklesham Lane	PRP obo Seaward Properties	80 units
Land at Barnfield Drive	Savills obo Brookhouse Group	Retail floorspace
Land at Drayton Manor	Savills obo SUEZ	Circa 500 dwellings
Land south of Shopwyke Road	Southern Planning Practice obo DC Heaver and Eurequity	
Land east of Broad Road, Hambrook	Southern Planning Practice obo Sunley Estates	120 dwellings plus community facilities
Land at Blackboy Lane and Clay Lane, Fishbourne	Strutt and Parker obo William Lacey Group	26 units
Foxbury Lane, Westbourne	Taylor Wimpey	Non-strategic development
Land at Little Farm, Loxwood	Thakeham Homes	Non-strategic development
Land at Harris Scrapyard and the Oaks Farm	WYG obo Metis Homes	130 dwellings