

Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029

Statement of Consultation



www.chichester.gov.uk/planningpolicy

May 2014

1	Introduction and summary	2
2	Focus on Strategic Growth Options (2010)	5
3	Proposed Submission Core Strategy (2010)	9
4	Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)	10
5	Parish Housing Numbers Consultation (2012)	15
6	Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach (2013)	18
7	Further Consultation on Preferred Approach (2013)	22
8	Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)	26

Appendices

A	FoSGO consultation	32
B	Housing Numbers and Locations consultation	35
C	Parish Housing Numbers consultation	37
D	Preferred Approach consultation	39
E	Further Consultation on the Preferred Approach	42
F	Pre-submission representation period	44

1 . Introduction and summary

1.1 This Statement of Consultation explains how Chichester District Council has undertaken consultation and stakeholder involvement to produce the Local Plan. It explains how on-going consultation and engagement has shaped the pre-submission version of the Local Plan. It has been produced to fulfil the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Regulations require that the documents published for pre-submission consultation on a local plan should include a statement setting out:

- which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18 (1);
- how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18;
- a summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and
- how those main issues have been addressed in the development plan document (the pre-submission Local Plan).

1.2 This Statement explains how consultation has been carried out over the various stages of preparation of the local plan as it has evolved. It includes an explanation of how the Council has come to prepare a local plan with associated development plan documents (DPDs) as this aids understanding of the consultation that has been undertaken. It explains the consultation that has been undertaken at each stage of the plan's evolution, including the methods used, the people involved, the outcome of the consultation and how this has influenced initially the local development framework and ultimately the local plan.

Overview of the consultation undertaken

1.3 There have been a number of consultation documents produced in order to prepare the vision, establish key issues and objectives, consider strategic options, prepare alternative strategies and determine key policies. Prior to the publication of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission version of the Local Plan consultation and engagement has taken place as outlined below:

4 January - 1 February 2010	Focus on Strategic Growth Options
26 August - 23 September 2011	Housing Numbers and Locations
27 September - 2 November 2012	Parish Housing Numbers
22 March - 3 May 2013	Local Plan: Key Policies - Preferred Approach
26 July - 16 September 2013	Further Consultation on Local Plan Key Policies - Preferred Approach

1.4 It is important to emphasise that consultation was not restricted to the periods outlined above; it has been on-going since 2009. During and between the consultation periods the Council has undertaken consultation with town and parish councils, residents associations, along with other stakeholders including developers, landowners and infrastructure providers.

Moving from a Core Strategy to a Local Plan

1.5 The Local Plan was originally prepared as a Core Strategy as part of a Local Development Framework (LDF). However, with the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Localism Act, the Council decided to produce a new Local Plan. The Local Plan uses past evidence, research and consultation undertaken on the Core Strategy to inform the proposals and policies as well as new evidence produced specifically for the new Local Plan.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

1.6 The Council has undertaken consultation and engagement in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The first SCI was produced in November 2009; the most recent version was published in January 2013. As the document was produced in accordance with the statutory procedures required, including an explanation of consultation undertaken, it is not considered necessary to repeat those in this Statement.

1.7 The SCI outlines who should be consulted at each stage of the Plan's production and the types of methods which could be used for effective involvement and can be viewed at www.chichester.gov.uk/newlocalplan.

Hard to reach groups

1.8 The Council is committed to engaging with hard to reach groups. Officers from the Council have attended workshops and public meetings. In addition to the workshops, a series of promotional events, using an un-staffed exhibition, have taken place in schools, colleges and the university, in order to target the hard-to-reach group of young people. Officers also attended a variety of community events to promote the Local Plan.

1.9 Promotion of the Local Plan consultation has also been undertaken through the medium of posters, postcards, leaflets, social media, and a video placed on the website.

1.10 More detail on how each consultation stage was undertaken is given under each section later in the document.

1.11 In 2013 the Council published the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). This work was undertaken by Opinion Research Services and Peter Brett Associates on behalf of the local authorities across Coastal West Sussex, the South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council. In 2012 a workshop was undertaken with representatives from Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople communities to identify their issues and needs. This event was led by the consultants but attended by housing and planning strategy officers from Coastal West Sussex. During the policy development stages inter-authority meetings were held to discuss planning issues and to formulate a possible consistent policy approach between Coastal West Sussex Authorities.

Setting up the consultation database

1.12 At the start of the process the Planning Policy team compiled a database including the following bodies:

1 . Introduction and summary

- **Specific Consultation Bodies** (those we have to consult to meet the statutory requirements) such as adjoining councils and agencies such as the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and utility providers. Please refer to the appendices for more detail.
- **General Consultation Bodies** which are those who have expressed a desire to be involved such as agents, developers and landowners, societies, charities and special interest groups, national groups and local business groups, hard to reach groups and members of the public.

1.13 The list has been kept up to date and has been added to as the plan process advances.

2 . Focus on Strategic Growth Options (2010)

4 January to 1 February 2010

Brief introduction to the consultation

2.1 In accordance with PPS12 and the Council's then adopted SCI, a front-loading exercise took place in 2010 under the banner "Focus on Strategic Growth Options" (FoSGO). The purpose of the FoSGO exercise was to raise early awareness of the new Local Development Framework and to gain views of local residents, employers, land owners and investors in the District to where future developments across Chichester District should be located and how these should be supported by infrastructure.

2.2 The FoSGO document was publicly available from December, however, due to the Christmas period the official consultation took place from 2 January to 1 February 2010.

Who was invited to make representations?

2.3 In addition to notification (by letter and/or email) of everyone on the consultation database, leaflets publicising the questionnaire and the consultation period were circulated to residents through the Council's Newsletter. Postcards were sent to all infant and junior schools to place in the children's book bags while leaflets and/or posters were sent to colleges, the university, leisure centres, parish councils, doctor's surgeries and supermarkets. Facebook was used for the first time to publicise the event.

2.4 Please refer to Appendix A for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

How were they invited to make representations?

2.5 The consultation documents consisted of:

A consultation paper: which set out the context of the LDF outlining why the document was produced, how much development was needed to be planned for and an indication of the issues facing the District. The vision and aims of delivering future development showed how the SE Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy informed the document. The main section of the document concentrated on strategic growth options for consideration and potential policy areas to be covered by the Core Strategy.

2.6 Questions were included throughout the consultation paper which was intended to act as a prompt to aid completion of the questionnaire.

2.7 The Strategic Growth Options are set out below:

Option 1 – Strategic Development around Chichester City	A combination of strategic locations at Chichester City: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• West of Chichester – up to 2,000 dwellings• South West of the City – up to 1,250 dwellings• East of the City – up to 1,000 dwellings• North East of the City – up to 1,500 dwellings
---	--

2 . Focus on Strategic Growth Options (2010)

Option 2 – Development around Chichester City and settlement hubs in the South of the District	Strategic development at Chichester City and at the settlement hubs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southbourne, East Wittering/Bracklesham and Selsey combined – up to 1,000 dwellings • Tangmere 500 – 1,500 dwellings
Option 3 - Development at the settlement hubs in the North and South excluding Chichester City	Development at the settlement hubs (including Midhurst and Petworth) but not at Chichester City
Option 4 – Development at other settlements in the District, excluding Chichester or settlement hubs	Strategic development at settlements or locations that are not hubs, including Fishbourne and Westhampnett in the South of the District
Option 5 – ‘Your Combination’	Request for suggestions for any alternative strategies, involving a new option or different combinations of development locations
Option 6 – ‘New Settlement’	Request for opinions on a new settlement in the District and any suggestions for where this might be located

A questionnaire was available on line and as a printed document based around the key issues from the consultation paper.

A summary leaflet: a short 4 page leaflet was designed to provide an overview of the areas covered in the consultation and giving details of where and how to respond to the consultation.

2.8 During the formal consultation period the consultation paper and questionnaire were made available online at the Council’s website using the online consultation portal Limehouse (Objective). Paper copies were also available to view at deposit points, council buildings and libraries.

Newspaper advertisements

2.9 To advertise the six week consultation, notices were put in Town and Parish newsletters and adverts in the local newspapers which cover the District.

Citizens Panel

2.10 The Council used the Citizens Panel which is a group of selected residents of the District, representative in age and geographical location to respond to the consultation paper and contents; 200 responses were received from this group.

2 . Focus on Strategic Growth Options (2010)

Town and Parish Council Presentation

2.11 A presentation and talk were given to Council Members to enable them to give presentations to Parish Councils where requested. This was designed to be an informative session to enable Parish Councils to engage and inform their communities on matters about the Core Strategy process.

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the key issues consultation

2.12 As a result of the consultation the Council received comments from a total of 227 respondents (excluding the Citizens Panel) who made comments on the consultation document; making a total of 968 individual comments.

2.13 Most consultees expressed a preference for dispersing development across a number of settlements, since this would minimise the impact of development. Concerns were raised by Natural England, Environment Agency and the Chichester Harbour Conservancy about the potential impacts of development in terms of recreational disturbance on birds at Chichester Harbour, particularly in terms of proposed locations to the south and west of the City.

2.14 The Environment Agency and Southern Water highlighted the need to take account of the lack of wastewater treatment capacity and environmental restrictions affecting the Apuldram WwTW which serves the Chichester City area. Similarly, the Highways Agency and West Sussex County Council considered that more evidence was needed on the impact of development on the A27 and local road network.

2.15 Comments were also received from landowners and developers in respect of the proposed strategic locations and other potential sites.

How the issues were addressed – developing a preferred strategy

2.16 One of the main topics of debate from the consultation was in relation to concentrating development around Chichester City (as encouraged by the SE Plan) or one of more dispersal between the settlement hubs. The most commonly cited reason for supporting a strategy of some development around the city than the settlement hubs was that it "spread the load" around the District. There were also a number of issues raised about the impact of development on Chichester Harbour, particularly as a result of the increase in dog walkers. A strategy was therefore developing which did not concentrate development to the west and south west of Chichester.

2.17 In developing a hybrid strategy of development around Chichester City and at settlement hubs, a wide range of factors were considered:

- the settlement hierarchy – the size and role of settlements, the range of facilities and transport linkages;
- the distribution of housing need – providing housing where it would best meet demand and local housing needs;
- infrastructure capacity and constraints, such as waste water treatment facilities, roads and traffic congestion;

2 . Focus on Strategic Growth Options (2010)

- environmental constraints – avoiding flood risk areas, protecting environmental designations, landscape quality and settlement character;
- the availability of potential housing sites, their deliverability and phasing; and
- national and regional guidance, including strategic policy guidance in the South East Plan.

3 . Proposed Submission Core Strategy (2010)

Proposed Submission Core Strategy June 2010

3.1 Following completion of the FoSGO consultation, Council officers began work on drafting a Proposed Submission Core Strategy, for submission in late Summer 2010. The South Downs National Park Shadow Authority was established on 1 April 2010, prior to the formal establishment of the National Park Authority on 1 April 2011. At this stage, it was still intended that the LDF should cover the whole of Chichester District, including the National Park area, with both the District Council and National Park Authority adopting the Core Strategy as the formal strategic planning framework for preparation of subsequent planning documents.

3.2 The Proposed Submission Core Strategy was a strategic planning document, setting out the broad spatial strategy and key planning policies, including identifying major development locations. It proposed to allocate smaller sites for housing, employment and other uses in a subsequent LDF document

Council Resolution

3.3 On the 20th July 2010, [Council](#) resolved that work on the preparation of the Core Strategy should cease pending clarification of the continued uncertainties over the provision of sufficient infrastructure to cope with future growth and the announcements expected from the government regarding reform of the planning system to reflect the new localism agenda and the associated transitional arrangements.

4 . Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)

26 August to 23 September 2011

Brief introduction to the consultation

4.1 The Housing Numbers and Locations Consultation Document covered Chichester District excluding the South Downs National Park. It was prepared to inform the overall level of housing provision and broad spatial strategy for housing development to be included in the Core Strategy. The document presented a number of different options and questions to seek public views on those issues.

4.2 The consultation document outlined several key changes to the planning system that had taken place since the FoSGO consultation in early 2010. Following the Localism Act it was proposed that the SE Plan would be abolished and local councils would have responsibility for determining housing numbers at the local level, in conjunction with their community. The options in the consultation were refined to take account of the feedback from FoSGO, together with new background information.

Who was invited to make representations?

4.3 In addition to notification (by letter and/or email) of everyone on the consultation database, leaflets publicising the questionnaire and the consultation period were circulated to residents through the Council's Newsletter. Postcards were sent to each District Councillor for circulation. Postcards and posters were sent to colleges, the university, leisure centres, parish councils, doctor's surgeries, community wardens, community centres and supermarkets. Postcards were also included in general mail from the Council and distributed at a variety of events.

4.4 Please refer to Appendix B for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

4.5 Facebook was used to publicise the event, as well as Twitter for the first time.

How were they invited to make representations?

Consultation documents

4.6 The Housing Numbers and Locations Consultation document sought views on a number of options regarding firstly the overall level of housing to be provided for in the Plan (Housing Numbers) and secondly the broad spatial distribution of housing (Housing Locations). The document included specific consultation questions on the housing options put forward for consideration, including all the specific locations identified. The consultation document was supported by two technical papers on Housing Numbers (Technical Paper 1) and Housing Locations (Technical Paper 2)

4.7 The options proposed for consultation are set out below.

Housing Numbers	
Options for Housing Numbers	Target A – 305 homes per year

4 . Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)

South of the District (Chichester District south of the National Park)	Target B – 330 homes per year Target C – 355 homes per year – the SE Plan figure Target D – 380 homes per year Target E – 415 homes per year
Options for Housing Numbers North of the District (excluding the National Park)	Target A – 12 homes per year Target B – 16 homes per year Target C – 20 homes per year
Housing Locations	
Option 1: Development Focus on Chichester City and Tangmere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfield/Shopwhyke, Chichester – 700 homes • North East Chichester City – 550 – 1,100 homes • Tangmere – between 1,200 and 1,500 homes • Non strategic/settlement hubs – 800 homes to 1,500
Option 2: Development focus on Chichester City and dispersed elsewhere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfield/Shopwhyke, Chichester – 700 homes • Non strategic/settlement hubs • 1,450 homes at East Wittering & Bracklesham, Southbourne and Selsey • 800 homes in other locations • <u>May</u> need additional sites
Option 3: Dispersed Development with focus on Tangmere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tangmere – between 950 and 1,500 homes • Non strategic/settlement hubs • 1,450 homes at East Wittering & Bracklesham, Southbourne and Selsey • 800 homes in other locations • <u>May</u> need additional sites
Option 4: Combination of Options 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfield/Shopwhyke, Chichester – 700 homes • Tangmere – up to 1,500 homes • Non strategic/settlement hubs -1,550 homes • 900 homes at East Wittering & Bracklesham, Southbourne and Selsey • 650 homes in other locations
Option 5: Maximise Housing in all Identified Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfield/Shopwhyke, Chichester – 700 homes • North East Chichester City - 1,500 homes • Tangmere – 1,500 homes • Non strategic/settlement hubs – 2,250 homes

4 . Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1,450 homes at East Wittering & Bracklesham, Southbourne and Selsey• 800 homes in other locations
--	--

4.8 It should be noted that the options put forward in the Housing Numbers and Locations consultation specifically excluded three potential strategic locations that had been included in FoSGO, namely West of Chichester, South West of Chichester and Fishbourne. Specific reasons why these locations had (at that time) been discounted as deliverable options were summarised in the consultation document and explained in greater detail in the Technical Paper 2 'Housing Locations'.

A questionnaire was available on line and as a printed document based around the questions asked in the consultation document.

4.9 During the formal consultation period the consultation paper and questionnaire were made available online at the Council's website using the online consultation portal Limehouse (now Objective). Paper copies were also available to view at deposit points, council buildings and libraries.

Newspaper advertisements

4.10 To advertise the six week consultation notices were put in Town and Parish newsletters, the Council's Homemove and Initiatives publications and adverts in the local newspapers that cover the District.

Media

4.11 An interview on the local radio station Spirit FM was undertaken to publicise the consultation

Town and Parish Council Presentation

4.12 A presentation and talk were given to Council Members to enable them to give presentations to Parish Councils where requested. This was designed to be an informative session to enable Parish Councils to engage and inform their communities on matters about the Core Strategy process. Presentations were also given to the Community Forums which inform local parishes of Council consultations.

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation

4.13 A total of 610 responses were received. Of these, 393 were received via the Limehouse (Objective) system and 217 via letters, printed questionnaires or email.

4.14 The key issues that were raised were:

- There was a clear preference for preserving and protecting the existing character and environment of the District.

4 . Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)

- There was a preference for the lower housing targets due to environmental and infrastructure constraints
- Key consultees wished to see potential locations in the “South of the District elsewhere” and “North of the District” categories to be defined more precisely with housing numbers allocated to each. This was considered necessary in order to enable them to provide more informed comments in terms of environmental and infrastructure impacts.
- Some respondents queried why the housing numbers to the North of the District were very low in comparison to housing numbers in the South of the District (though, in some cases, this reflected a lack of understanding that the North of District figures related only to areas outside the National Park).
- Concerns that a solution to the wastewater infrastructure problems would be provided within the timeframe needed to deliver development.
- Preference for sites which are furthest away from environmental designations (e.g Chichester Harbour and Pagham Harbour)
- Concerns about high levels of development on the Manhood Peninsula because of flood issues, poor transport links and congestion problems.

Further Consultation

4.15 Following the main consultation period (26 August – 23 September 2011), on the 9 November 2011 an additional consultation was undertaken with statutory agencies concerning the three potential strategic locations not included in the Housing Numbers and Locations consultation (West of Chichester, South West of Chichester and Fishbourne). This consultation was undertaken to check that the reasons for excluding the sites as a result of the FoSGO consultation were still valid. The statutory agencies were asked the following questions:

1. Do you consider West of Chichester to be a suitable location for major development? (Potential for a new community (500 to 1500 homes) linked to Chichester City, to provide linked employment, new community facilities, public open space and managed green spaces, and improved access/transport links to the City).
2. Do you consider Fishbourne to be a suitable location for major development? (Potential for a new community (up to 1000 homes) linked to Chichester City, to provide linked employment, new community facilities, public open space and managed green spaces, and improved access/transport links to the City).
3. Do you consider South West of Chichester to be a suitable location for major development? (Potential for a new community (up to 1200 homes) linked to Chichester City, to provide linked employment, new community facilities, public open space and managed green spaces, and improved access/transport links to the City)

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation

4.16 The responses received can be viewed under supporting documents at http://chichester-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/cs/housing_numbers_and_locations

- Concerns with proximity to the Harbour and likely significant effect on the SPA due to increased recreational pressure, particularly with South West of Chichester and Fishbourne.
- Potential additional impact on the Fishbourne roundabout and the A27.

4 . Housing Numbers and Locations (2011)

- All three locations may be contrary to the SE Plan policy NRM5 due to their proximity to Chichester Harbour SPA
- Potential constraints as Apuldram WwTW

How the issues were addressed – developing a preferred strategy

4.17 The outcome of this consultation highlighted the need to undertake more detailed research investigating the ability of strategic development to occur.

4.18 Additional work was undertaken with transport modelling of the potential strategic sites and the impact on the A27.

4.19 The on-going Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project looked at recreational disturbance and potential mitigation measures. Officers were part of the working group undertaking this study, which formed evidence for the strategic site selection process.

4.20 Building on the issues already highlighted with Apuldram WwTW, there was further joint working with Southern Water, Environment Agency, Natural England and Chichester Harbour Conservancy.

5 . Parish Housing Numbers Consultation (2012)

27 September to 2 November 2012

Brief introduction to the consultation

5.1 The Council undertook an informal consultation with parish and town councils across the Chichester Local Plan area (which excludes the South Downs National Park) on proposed indicative parish housing numbers that the Council was considering for inclusion in the Local Plan. These housing numbers were intended for inclusion in the new Local Plan to indicate the scale of housing that would be provided in each parish over the Plan period to 2029. The stated intention was that housing sites to meet these targets would be identified either through neighbourhood plans or in a Site Allocations DPD that the Council would prepare following the Local Plan Key Policies document.

5.2 The consultation requested the views of each parish council on the indicative range of housing numbers proposed for their parish and whether there were specific issues which the parish considered may prevent delivery of the housing or affect its timing and phasing.

Who was invited to make representations?

5.3 As well as the Parish and Town Councils the consultation was also extended to include key infrastructure providers, statutory agencies and neighbouring planning authorities.

5.4 Please refer to Appendix C for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

How were they invited to make representations?

5.5 The [consultation document](#) was made up of:

- A letter from the Council Planning and Housing Portfolio Holder (Councillor Janet Duncton) inviting comments on a range of housing numbers for each Parish, which will inform the new Local Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plan.
- A schedule identifying the range of housing numbers being proposed for each parish in the Plan area (outside the South Downs National Park).
- A Questions and Answers sheet, providing more information about the Local Plan approach to providing new housing.
- A sheet showing key summary facts about each Parish, including:
 - The population and household figures from the 2001 Census, as 2011 Census information at Parish level was not available.
 - Recent housing development included details about new homes built over the ten years to 2011. The Parish total included new homes built both inside the villages and outside the village in the rural area.
 - Planned housing development included homes which had planning permission at 1 April 2011.
 - Parish Local Housing Need information was taken directly from the Council's Housing Register.

5 . Parish Housing Numbers Consultation (2012)

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation

5.6 In response to the consultation, parish councils raised a range of issues covering matters such as development constraints, infrastructure, and the timing and phasing of housing delivery. A [consultation report](#) was taken to the Council's Development Plan Panel on 20 November 2012, summarising the responses made by the Parishes and statutory consultees.

How the issues were addressed – developing a preferred strategy

5.7 The Parish Housing Numbers consultation was helpful in providing an opportunity for parish councils and key stakeholders to comment on the proposed distribution of housing prior to drafting the Local Plan. This provided a better understanding of the main issues and concerns of the parishes, particularly in terms of identifying suitable housing sites, potential development constraints and the need to improve local infrastructure and facilities to support new development. However, it was accepted by the vast majority of parish councils that some new housing would be needed in smaller settlements to address local housing needs and support existing local facilities.

5.8 In addition, it was considered to be unwise to rely solely for housing delivery on large strategic sites, particularly in view of the wastewater constraints affecting Chichester City and Tangmere. There was an urgent need to address the five-year housing supply shortfall, resulting in the Council being vulnerable to losing sites on appeal. These factors required the Council to look to bring forward sites in locations less constrained by wastewater issues.

5.9 In response to these comments, and further representations by Councillors, a number of amendments were made to the parish housing numbers taken forward into the Local Plan. In summary, the main changes were:

- It was proposed to allocate strategic sites at Southbourne, Selsey and East Wittering/Bracklesham early in the Plan period, rather than leaving this to neighbourhood plans or a future Site Allocations document (see above). Subsequently, discussions with the relevant parish led to the change in approach now put forward in the Plan.
- The proposed housing numbers for East Wittering/ Bracklesham were reduced substantially from 350-600 homes to 100 homes. This reflected concerns by the Parish Council and local Members over the proposed scale of development on the Manhood Peninsula. These concerns primarily related to transport constraints, potential environmental impacts and concerns over lack of local employment opportunities.
- The parish housing numbers for Chichester City were reduced, as the NHS Trust land identified in the Sites at Chichester City North Development Brief were now included in the housing supply figures.
- The housing numbers for Southbourne Parish were split between the strategic allocation at Southbourne village (300 homes) and a further 50 homes to be identified at other settlements in the Parish.
- In all the other parishes, the minimum figure proposed in the range proposed in the Parish Housing Numbers consultation was adopted as the indicative housing target.

5 . Parish Housing Numbers Consultation (2012)

5.10 The net effect of these adjustments was to reduce the amount of housing proposed on parish housing sites to a total of 775 homes, plus a further 550 homes proposed as strategic allocations at the three settlement hubs of Southbourne, Selsey and East Wittering/Bracklesham.

6 . Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach (2013)

22 March to 3 May 2013

Brief introduction to the consultation

6.1 The purpose of the Preferred Approach consultation was to seek the views on the Council's proposals for strategic development locations for new homes, a set of area-based strategic policies and the detailed strategic delivery policies designed to provide the policy framework for the emerging draft Local Plan. The document included sections on:

- the overall strategy;
- an overarching vision and strategic objectives for how the District should evolve over the plan period;
- a set of visions for the three sub-areas identified in the strategy
- the housing requirement for the plan period;
- proposed locations for housing
- a settlement hierarchy and development strategy
- area-based strategic policies
- strategic delivery policies

6.2 The document was based on the themes of the Chichester Sustainable Community Strategy (2009):

- The Economy
- Housing and Neighbourhoods
- Transport, Access and Communications
- The Environment
- Health and Well Being

Who was invited to make representations?

6.3 All consultees registered on the Planning Policy database were consulted. This includes all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups.

6.4 Please refer to Appendix D for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

How were they invited to make representations?

Consultation documents

6.5 The consultation documents consisted of three components:

- **A key policies consultation document:** *Draft Local Plan Key Policies – Preferred Approach.* This document set out the overall strategy, area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.
- **An Initial Sustainability Appraisal.** This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against

6 . Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach (2013)

the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the Council's decision making process.

- **An Equalities Impact Assessment.** This included an assessment of the policies within the consultation document to ensure they did not discriminate against any particular people or groups. It addresses issues relating to particular groups of people and how any negative impacts of the Local Plan would be mitigated.

6.6 The above documents can be viewed at: http://chichester-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/local_plan/lp_pref_approach

Methods of consultation

6.7 A press release was sent to all newspapers within the District. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer, which provided weekly coverage of the Local Plan, and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website. An email was sent out to all consultees prior to the consultation, with a letter posted to those without email addresses.

6.8 The Preferred Approach consultation document and response form were available on the Council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.

6.9 The documents were made available at the Council's usual deposit points:

- Chichester District Council offices, Midhurst Area Office and Selsey Area Office (including computers for public internet access)
- Public libraries: Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey, Southbourne, Witterings and mobile libraries

6.10 The consultation was publicised in Initiatives and via the Council's Facebook and Twitter accounts, and a promotional video was placed on the Local Plan website and the Council's YouTube page.

6.11 Publicity materials including posters, leaflets and postcards were distributed to Members, Parish Councils and a variety of locations around the District. Freestanding banners were displayed in the reception at East Pallant House, Chichester College, the University of Chichester and Westgate Leisure (at both Chichester and Southbourne) for the duration of the consultation, as well as roaming banners displayed at district libraries and drop-in sessions.

6.12 Nine drop-in sessions with planning policy staff were held around the District, with attendance ranging between 17 to 31 people. Many of those in attendance had participated in previous consultations informing the Local Plan and were familiar with the topics covered in the document.

6.13 Officers attended meetings at the Parklands Residents Association, Chichester City Council, Westhampnett Parish Council and Tangmere Village Centre to talk in more detail about the Local Plan and answer questions from the public. Each of these events was attended by approximately 70 people.

6 . Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach (2013)

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation

6.14 A total of 4,968 responses were received from 868 consultees. The range of comments covered most aspects of the Plan, with the highest frequency relating to the strategic development locations.

6.15 The following summary sets out some of the main matters raised by respondents:

Development Strategy

- Support and opposition to the proposed settlement hierarchy
- Suggested reviews for settlement boundaries
- Clarify definitions of service villages/classification process

Housing and Neighbourhoods

- Opposition to the amount of housing proposed and the strategic development locations

Manhood Peninsula

- Development on the Manhood should only follow infrastructure improvements, in particular with regard to sewage network capacity.

Next steps

6.16 Following an analysis of the key issues raised during the consultation, review groups were held with Members to discuss potential substantial changes to parts of the draft Local Plan Preferred Approach. A report detailing these changes was considered by Council on 23 July 2013, when it was agreed to hold a further Regulation 18 stage consultation on the proposed amendments. The following amendments were proposed for consultation from 26 July to 16 September 2013:

- **Policy 2 Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy and supporting text:** amended as set out in the report.
- **Policy 4 Housing Provision:** The housing target in the Draft Local Plan should be adjusted to 410 homes per year spread across the whole of the Local Plan period instead of 395 homes per year plus an initial 258 homes shortfall.
- **Policy 10 Environment Strategy:** Removal of this policy on the basis that references to other policies are included in the supporting text.
- **Policy 16 West of Chichester Strategic Development Location:** Amendments to site boundary to exclude Brandy Hole Copse, additional text to criteria.
- **Policy 18 Westhampnett Strategic Development Location:** Amendments to site boundary; amendments to policy text as set out in the report.
- **Policy 19 Tangmere Strategic Development Location:** Amendments to site boundary
- **Policy 33 Horticultural Development:** Additions and amendments to policy criteria as set out in report.

6 . Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach (2013)

- **Policy 37 Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople:** Supporting text amended to reflect recently finalised Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment
- **Policy 50 Development and Disturbance of Birds in Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area:** Amendments to policy and supporting text
- **Policy New:** Additional policy relating to the Disturbance of Birds in Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area
- **Policy 51 Green Infrastructure:** Additional maps and supporting text relating to the delivery of Green Infrastructure through the Strategic Development Sites and masterplanning be introduced in into an appendix.
- **Policy New:** Additional policy with regard to the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

7 . Further Consultation on Preferred Approach (2013)

26 July to 16 September 2013

Brief introduction to the consultation

7.1 Following feedback received on the spring 2013 Preferred Approach consultation document, the Council proposed changes to the Local Plan Preferred Approach in order to make the Plan clearer, and to update policies in response to updated background evidence. In total ten policies were consulted on, including two new policies in relation to Chichester Harbour AONB and Pagham Harbour SPA. An appendix was added to the draft Local Plan, to provide guidance on how Green Infrastructure will feed into the strategic development locations. The document made clear where wording had been amended, added or removed.

7.2 Only those policies that had been changed significantly were included in the document for consultation. It was made clear in the introduction to the document that all previous comments made on the draft Local Plan remained valid.

Who was invited to make representations?

7.3 All consultees registered on the database were consulted. This includes all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups.

7.4 Please refer to Appendix E for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

How were they invited to make representations?

Consultation documents

7.5 The consultation documents consisted of three components:

- **A further key policies consultation document:** *Further Consultation on Draft Local Plan Key Policies – Preferred Approach.* This included only those policies that had been subject to significant change as a result of the earlier Preferred Approach consultation. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.
- **An Initial Sustainability Appraisal.** This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for strategic policies and policies relating to the strategic development locations at West of Chichester, Westhampnett and Tangmere, considered against the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the Council's decision making process.
- **An Equalities Impact Assessment.** This included an assessment of the changed policies within the consultation document to ensure they did not discriminate against any particular people or groups.

7.6 The above documents can be viewed at: http://chichester-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/local_plan/further_pref_app.

7 . Further Consultation on Preferred Approach (2013)

Methods of consultation

7.7 A press release was sent to all newspapers within the District. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer, which provided weekly coverage of the Local Plan, and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website. An email was sent out to all consultees prior to the consultation, with a letter posted to those without email addresses.

7.8 The further consultation document and response form were available on the Council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.

7.9 The documents were made available at the Council's usual deposit points:

- Chichester District Council offices, Midhurst Area Office and Selsey Area Office (including computers for public internet access)
- Public libraries: Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey, Southbourne, Witterings and mobile libraries

7.10 No exhibitions were held at this stage.

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the consultation

7.11 A consultation report was prepared summarising the comments made by chapter and by policy. The report was considered by special Cabinet on 24 October 2013. The following summary sets out some of the main matters raised by respondents:

Policy 2: Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

- Continued opposition concerning the classification of some settlements within the hierarchy, levels of development and the need for provision of new infrastructure.
- General support for the introduction of settlement boundaries for Service Villages, in addition to Settlement Hubs and Chichester city.
- Opposition from some individuals and parish councils on the supporting text indicating how the Council would assess planning applications for development proposals contiguous with the Settlement Boundary. Some support for this text from developers and landowners, but requesting modifications and/ or inclusion within Policy 2.

Paragraph 7.3 Housing Provision

- Proposed housing figure of 410 homes per year too high - given character of area, Chichester city heritage, environmental constraints and infrastructure deficits
- Proposed housing figure too low – Council has provided Insufficient justification for not meeting full objectively assessed needs identified in SHMA

7 . Further Consultation on Preferred Approach (2013)

Policy 10: Environment Strategy

- Concerns with the removal of Policy 10 and strengthening the linked policies
- Support the removal of Policy 10

Policy 16: West of Chichester Strategic Development Location

- Support for retention of undeveloped land north of B2178 to protect Brandy Hole Copse and setting of Scheduled Monument
- Continued opposition to the number of homes proposed, encroachment of Chichester-Fishbourne gap, resulting traffic congestion; development of a greenfield site and unsustainable location
- Continued concern about safety of road accesses both to the north and south of the site; requests for a north-south link road to prevent rat running along Sherborne Road.

Policy 18: Westhampnett/North East Chichester Strategic Development Location

- Not a suitable location for strategic development; insufficient developable land within site to accommodate 500 homes
- Proposed development would merge Chichester and Westhampnett
- No justification provided for restricting developable area to “mainly to the south of Madgwick Lane”; site has capacity for at least 800 homes
- 400m noise buffer should only be used as broad starting point for detailed noise assessments which should determine developable area

Policy 33: Horticultural Development

- Opposition from the horticultural industry who would prefer a criteria based policy; concern raised over the use of CPO powers
- Opposition to the inclusion of the criterion “the proposal is not located within open countryside and ensures that long views across substantially open land are retained”.

7 . Further Consultation on Preferred Approach (2013)

Policy 37: Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- Request to safeguard existing sites, increase transit site provision, and, in conjunction with West Sussex County Council, use public owned land to address additional need for pitches.
- Concern over methodology of the 2% growth rate in the Coastal West Sussex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.

Policy New:Development and Disturbance of Birds in Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area

- Concern with the inconsistent approach taken with reference to Arun District Council's policy on Pagham Harbour and the Duty to Cooperate

Appendix 4 - Green Infrastructure

- Concerns with the existing cycle network and whether the Council's aspirations could be delivered.

How the issues raised from the Preferred Approach and Further Consultation were addressed – developing the pre-submission Local Plan.

7.12 A consultation report set out draft Council responses to all of the issues raised from the Local Plan: Key Policies Preferred Approach and Further Consultation, and this report was considered and endorsed at a [Council](#) meeting on 24 October 2013, when the pre-submission Local Plan was approved for publication.

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

8 November 2013 to 6 January 2014

Brief introduction to the representation period

8.1 Following the Regulation 18 Preferred Approach consultations that took place in spring and summer 2013, the responses received and further technical work were considered to aid the preparation of a Proposed Submission Local Plan. This was published prior to its submission to the Secretary of State to allow for representations to be made on its soundness and legal compliance.

Who was invited to make representations?

8.2 All consultees registered on the database were consulted. This includes all statutory consultees, agents, developers and interest groups.

8.3 Please refer to Appendix F for a full list of statutory consultees who provided a response to this consultation.

How were they invited to make representations?

Consultation documents

8.4 The proposed submission documents consisted of four components:

- **The pre-submission document:** *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission 2014-2029*. This is the document that the Council intends to formally submit to the Secretary of State for independent examination. This document set out the overall strategy, area based strategic policies and strategic delivery policies for the Local Plan area. The introduction to the document explained what the consultation was about, how to get involved and what happens next.
- **A Sustainability Appraisal.** This document included an assessment of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options for policies considered against the sustainability objectives. The report sets out the information that fed into the Council's decision making process.
- **Habitats Regulations Assessment.** The objective of the assessment was to identify any aspects of the Local Plan that would cause and adverse effect on the integrity of European sites, either in isolation or in combination with other plans and projects, and to advise on appropriate policy mechanisms for delivering mitigation where such effects were identified.
- **An Equalities Impact Assessment.** This included an assessment of the policies within the consultation document to ensure they did not discriminate against any particular people or groups. It addresses issues relating to particular groups of people and how any negative impacts of the Local Plan would be mitigated.

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

8.5 A **Statement of Representation Procedures**, which set out details of the representation period, where documents could be obtained and how representations could be made was available on the Council's [Local Plan website](#), and was sent to all consultees via email or post at the start of the representation period.

8.6 The representation form and **Guidance Notes** for the representation form were also available on the Council's [Local Plan website](#), sent out to consultees via email, and in hard copy at the deposit points. The guidance notes provided more information on legal compliance and soundness, as well as more general advice, in order to aid consultees in making representations.

8.7 The above documents can be viewed at: http://chichester-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/local_plan/pre-sub.

Methods of consultation

8.8 A press release was sent to all newspapers within the District, Parish Councils, radio stations and television stations. An advert was placed in the Chichester Observer, which provided weekly coverage of the Local Plan, and the consultation was publicised on the homepage of the Chichester District Council website as well as Facebook and Twitter.

8.9 An email was sent out to all consultees prior to the consultation, with a letter posted to those without email addresses.

8.10 All proposed submission documents, guidance notes and the response form were available on the Council's website, and consultation responses were invited via the online consultation portal, via email or in writing.

8.11 The documents were made available at the Council's usual deposit points:

- Chichester District Council offices, Midhurst Area Office and Selsey Area Office (including computers for public internet access)
- Public libraries: Chichester, Midhurst, Petworth, Selsey, Southbourne, Witterings, Billingshurst and mobile libraries

8.12 No exhibitions were held at this stage.

A summary of the main issues raised as a result of the representation period

8.13 A total of 477 representations were received from 119 individual respondents.

8.14 A [consultation report](#) was prepared summarising the comments made by chapter and by policy. The report was considered by the Council's Development Plan Panel on 13 February 2014. The following summary sets out some of the main matters raised by respondents:

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

Housing numbers/phasing

- Plan challenged as a result of being unable to meet full objectively assessed need. The Plan fails to demonstrate how the housing shortfall will be met
- The Council has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the constraints affecting the Plan area are so severe that higher housing numbers could not be accommodated
- Plan makes insufficient provision for historic under-delivery and should seek to provide for higher end of OAN range
- Housing requirements are based on "demand" rather than "need" - 200 dwellings per year would be sufficient and sustainable
- Proposed housing figure of 410 homes per year too high - given character of area, Chichester city heritage, environmental constraints and infrastructure deficits
- Assessment of housing needs ignores localism and adopts a top-down approach
- Plan should phase early delivery of West of Chichester, Southbourne, Kirdford and Loxwood development sites to maximise delivery
- Parish housing sites will not be capable of delivering by 2015/16 if dependent on Site Allocation DPD
- Additional sites put forward across the Plan area.
- All new dwellings should count towards indicative housing figures - only counting development of 6 or more dwellings is inappropriate for the villages
- Parish housing numbers are too low/too high

Plan Strategy

- The Plan is too dependent on strategic sites with insufficient consideration of alternative options
- More housing should be allocated to the Manhood Peninsula to reduce the focus at Chichester city
- Lack of joined working with neighbouring authorities to assess the possibility of new settlements within the general area

Infrastructure

- Concern that infrastructure in the Plan area is inadequate to cope with additional development.

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

- Plan does not provide adequate sustainable travel and cycling provision
- Insufficient traffic investigation has been undertaken to assess impact of proposed development on local roads in Parklands
- Highways Agency considers the Plan transport package provides adequate mitigation with regard to A27 junctions
- Insufficient account has been taken of the cumulative impact of development on the Manhood in terms of infrastructure requirements

Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

- Opposition concerning the classification of some settlements within the hierarchy, levels of development and the need for provision of new infrastructure
- The settlement hierarchy is too rigid and should be amended to allow development on urban fringe sites
- The lack of infrastructure means Tangmere should be defined as a Service Village, rather than a Settlement Hub
- The absence of mechanism to consider proposals outside Settlement Boundaries is likely to prejudice early delivery of housing at sustainable locations earlier in the plan period

West of Chichester Strategic Development Location

- Broad support for this site was given by the Environment Agency, English Heritage, West Sussex County Council and the site promoters, Linden Homes & Miller Strategic Ltd. Concerns regarding West of Chichester were broadly based on the following topics:
- Impact on biodiversity/sustainability/environment (Chichester Harbour SPA)
- Number of new dwellings
- Infrastructure requirements (transport, wastewater)
- Access to the southern part of the site

Westhampnett/North East Chichester Strategic Development Location

- Promoters for the site argue it could accommodate 1,100 dwellings. Concerns regarding the site were broadly based on the following topics:
- Coalescence of settlements

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

- Flooding
- Landscape and heritage
- Green Infrastructure
- Noise
- Infrastructure

Tangmere Strategic Development Location

- Broad support was received from English Heritage for this policy. Concerns regarding Tangmere Strategic Development Location were broadly based on:
- Housing numbers (ranging from 500 to 2000 suggested)
- Infrastructure requirements and funding
- Sustainability
- Wastewater treatment works upgrade
- Green space/environment/biodiversity

Horticultural Development

- Opposition from the horticultural industry who would prefer a criteria based policy; concern raised over the use of CPO powers
- The Plan has not considered a sufficiently robust evidence base in continuing to rely on HDA designations
- Policy criteria limit the development of horticultural production companies and place supporting industry and infrastructure at risk

Planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- Policy should be made as clear and unambiguous as possible in order to provide a clear objective basis for decision making.

8 . Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission (2013/2014)

Sustainability Appraisal

- The SA does not describe the options considered or what assumptions were made in the assessment of alternative options
- The evidence base is not sufficient to support the strategic sites put forward by the Local Plan

What happens next?

8.15 A report setting out the proposed modifications to the Local Plan: Key Policies Pre-submission was considered and endorsed at a [Council](#) meeting on 24 April 2014.

8.16 The Council has [agreed](#) to formally submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State, alongside the schedule of proposed modifications.

Appendix A . FoSGO consultation

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	312
Email	344
Letter	312
Total	968

A.1 The total number of individual respondents was 233.

Statutory consultees

A.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
BT	Mr Don Lynn
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Ms Linda Park
Defence Estates (MoD)	Ms Lara Storr
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Government Office for the South East	Mr John Cheston
Havant Borough Council	Mr Andrew Biltcliffe
Highways Agency	Ms Nawal Laazrak
National Trust	Mrs Jane Arnott
Natural England	Mr Ian Campbell
NHS West Sussex	Ms Jessica O'Connor
Portsmouth Water Ltd	Mr Paul Sansby
SEEDA	Mr Detlef Golletz
South Downs Joint Committee	Mr Martin Small
South East England Partnership Board	Ms Sue Janota
Southern Electric Power Distribution PLC	Mr John Tierney
Southern Water	Mrs Susan Solbra
The Coal Authority	Miss Rachael A Bust

Statutory body	Contact
Waverley Borough Council	Mr Graham Parrott
West Sussex County Council	Ms Lucy Seymour-Bowdery

Town and Parish Councils

A.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Aldingbourne Parish Council
Bepton Parish Council
Birdham Parish Council
Bosham Parish Council
Bury Parish Council
Chichester City Council
Chidham Parish Council
Cocking Parish Council
Donnington Parish Council
East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council
Fernhurst Parish Council
Fishbourne Parish Council
Funtington Parish Council
Haslemere Town Council
Hunston Parish Council
Lavant Parish Council
Lynchmere Parish Council
Midhurst Town Council
Milland Parish Council
North Mundham Parish Council

Appendix A . FoSGO consultation

Parish/Town Council
Oving Parish Council
Petworth Parish Council
Selsey Town Council
Sidlesham Parish Council
Singleton Parish Council
Tangmere Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
West Wittering Parish Council
Westbourne Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council
Wisborough Green Parish Council
Woolbeding With Redford Parish Council

Appendix B . Housing Numbers and Locations consultation

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	395
Email	8
Letter	65
Other	143
Total	611

B.1 The total number of individual respondents was 611.

Statutory consultees

B.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
Arun District Council	Mr Simon Meecham
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Ms Linda Park
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Highways Agency	Ms Nawal Laazrak
Natural England	Ms Marian Ashdown
South Downs National Park	Mr Tim Richings
Southern Water	Mrs Susan Solbra
Waverley Borough Council	Mr Graham Parrott
West Sussex County Council	Ms Lucy Seymour-Bowdery

Town and Parish Councils

B.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Birdham Parish Council
Bury Parish Council
Chichester City Council

Appendix B . Housing Numbers and Locations consultation

Parish/Town Council
Chidham Parish Council
Earnley Parish Council
East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council
Fishbourne Parish Council
Funtington Parish Council
Hunston Parish Council
Kirdford Parish Council
North Mundham Parish Council
Oving Parish Council
Selsey Town Council
Sidlesham Parish Council
Southbourne Parish Council
Tangmere Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
West Wittering Parish Council
Westbourne Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council
Wisborough Green Parish Council

Appendix C . Parish Housing Numbers consultation

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	3,381
Email	991
Letter	596
Total	4,968

C.1 The total number of individual respondents was 868.

Statutory consultees

C.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
Arun District Council	Mr Simon Meecham
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Ms Linda Park
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Highways Agency	Ms Elizabeth Cleaver
Natural England	Mr John Lister
NHS Sussex	Mr Mike Pritchard
Southern Water	Mrs Susan Solbra
Waverley Borough Council	Mr Graham Parrott

Town and Parish Councils

C.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Apuldram Parish Council
Birdham Parish Council
Boxgrove Parish Council
Chichester City Council
Donnington Parish Council

Appendix C . Parish Housing Numbers consultation

Parish/Town Council
Earnley Parish Council
East Wittering Parish Council
Fishbourne Parish Council
Hunston Parish Council
Kirdford Parish Council
Loxwood Parish Council
Lynchmere Parish Council
North Mundham Parish Council
Plaistow & Ifold Parish Council
Selsey Town Council
Southbourne Parish Council
Tangmere Parish Council
West Wittering Parish Council
Westbourne Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council
Wisborough Green Parish Council

C.4 No responses were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Bosham Parish Council
Chidham and Hambrook Parish Council
Oving Parish Council
Sidlesham Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
West Thorney Parish Council

Appendix D . Preferred Approach consultation

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	3,381
Email	991
Letter	596
Total	4,968

D.1 The total number of individual respondents was 868.

Statutory consultees

D.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Ms Linda Park
Coastal West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS)	Mr Mike Pritchard
English Heritage	Mr Martin Small
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Hampshire County Council	Mr Pete Errington
Havant Borough Council	Ms Lucy Howard
Natural England	Mr John Lister
Portsmouth Water Ltd	Mr Paul Sansby
South Downs National Park	Mr Tim Richings
Southern Water	Mrs Susan Solbra
Sussex Wildlife Trust	Mrs Janyis Watson
Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Ms Carmelle Bell
Waverley Borough Council	Mr Graham Parrott
West Sussex County Council	Mr Darryl Hemmings

Town and Parish Councils

D.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Appendix D . Preferred Approach consultation

Parish/Town Council
Birdham Parish Council
Bosham Parish Council
Chichester City Council
Donnington Parish Council
Earnley Parish Council
East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council
Fishbourne Parish Council
Funtington Parish Council
Kirdford Parish Council
Lavant Parish Council
Loxwood Parish Council
North Mundham Parish Council
Plaistow and Ifold Parish Council
Selsey Parish Council
Sidlesham Parish Council
Southbourne Parish Council
Tangmere Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
West Wittering Parish Council
Westbourne Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council
Wisborough Green Parish Council

Public drop-in sessions

Venue	Date	Attendees
Westgate Centre, Chichester	Friday 22 March 2013	24

Appendix D . Preferred Approach consultation

Venue	Date	Attendees
Bracklesham Barn, Bracklesham Bay	Monday 25 March 2013	23
The Assembly Rooms, Chichester	Wednesday 27 March 2013	26
Bourne Leisure Centre, Southbourne	Thursday 28 March 2013	20
Chichester Farmers' Market	Friday 5 April 2013	19
Wisborough Green Farmers' Market	Thursday 11 April 2013	27
Selsey Centre, Selsey	Sunday 14 April 2013	28
Westgate Centre, Chichester	Friday 19 April 2013	31
Chichester Children and Family Centre	Tuesday 23 April 2013	17

Parish Council and Residents' Association meetings

Venue	Date	Attendees
Parklands Residents' Association	Saturday 23 March 2013	75 (approx)
Chichester City Council Annual Parish Meeting	Wednesday 10 April 2013	78 (approx)
Tangmere Parish Council Meeting	Friday 12 April 2013	70 (approx)
Westhampnett Parish Council Meeting	Monday 15 April 2013	70 (approx)

Appendix E . Further Consultation on the Preferred Approach

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	331
Email	250
Letter	1,116
Total	1,697

E.1 The total number of individual respondents was 256.

Statutory consultees

E.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
Arun District Council	Mr Simon Meecham
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Mr Jon Holmes
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Highways Agency	Mrs Elizabeth Cleaver
Marine Management Organisation	Ms Angela Atkinson
Natural England	Mr John Lister
South Downs National Park Authority	Mr Tim Richings
West Sussex County Council	Mr Darryl Hemmings

Town and Parish Councils

E.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Birdham Parish Council
Chichester City Council
Earnley Parish Council
Kirdford Parish Council
Selsey Town Council

Appendix E . Further Consultation on the Preferred Approach

Parish/Town Council
Sidlesham Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
Westbourne Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council
Wisborough Green Parish Council

Appendix F . Pre-submission representation period

Response rate:

Objective consultation portal	187
Email	285
Letter	5
Total	477

F.1 The total number of individual respondents was 119.

Statutory consultees

F.2 Responses were received from the following statutory consultees (excluding town or parish councils):

Statutory body	Contact
Arun District Council	Mr Simon Meecham
Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Mr Jon Holmes
East Hampshire District Council	Mr Andrew Biltcliffe
English Heritage	Mr Martin Small
Environment Agency	Mrs Hannah Hyland
Havant Borough Council	Mr Andrew Biltcliffe Ms Lucy Howard
Highways Agency	Mrs Elizabeth Cleaver
Homes and Communities Agency	Mr Ken Glendinning
Natural England	Mr John Lister
NHS Property Services	Mr Michael Pritchard
Portsmouth Water Ltd	Mr Paul Sansby
South Downs National Park Authority	Mr Keith Reed
Southern Water	Mrs Susan Solbra
Thames Water Utilities Ltd	Ms Carmelle Bell
West Sussex County Council	Mr Darryl Hemmings

Appendix F . Pre-submission representation period

Town and Parish Councils

F.3 Representations were received from the following town and parish councils:

Parish/Town Council
Bosham Parish Council
Hunston Parish Council
Kirdford Parish Council
Tangmere Parish Council
West Itchenor Parish Council
Westhampnett Parish Council

Produced by

Planning Policy - Chichester District Council,
East Pallant House, 1 East Pallant,
Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1TY