

## Becca Stokes

---

**From:** Steve Lawrence <steve.lawrence@conservancy.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 September 2015 14:41  
**To:** Valerie Dobson  
**Cc:** Rosie Spanner; Richard Austin  
**Subject:** Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** Appx 2 Item 7.pdf

Dear Valerie,

I refer to your email dated 6 August 2015, timed at 15.37 hours, in respect of the above.

This matter was considered at today's meeting of the Conservancy's Planning Consultative Committee.

It resolved that the Conservancy's comments made 6.3.15 (timed 13.14 hours) and earlier comments sent 24.7.14 should still stand for consideration by the Examiner, before they make their final recommendations.

I re-attach those comments for your ease of reference.

Yours sincerely

Steve Lawrence MRTPI  
Planning Officer (Mon/Thurs/Fri)(Job share with Mrs Linda Park MRTPI)  
Chichester Harbour Conservancy  
Dell Quay Office, Dell Quay, Chichester, PO20 7EE  
01243 533 991  
[www.conservancy.co.uk](http://www.conservancy.co.uk)

---

Did you know there are lots of disabled access paths and facilities within Chichester Harbour? The *Solar Heritage*, our solar powered catamaran also has a wheelchair lift. For more information on access to the Harbour [click here](#).

*Confidential information may be contained in this email message and is intended only for use of the addressee. If you receive this email message by mistake, please notify [info@conservancy.co.uk](mailto:info@conservancy.co.uk) and delete this email, which must not be copied, distributed or disclosed to any other person.*

---

## LEGAL DISCLAIMER

Communications on or through Chichester District Councils computer systems may be monitored or recorded to secure effective system operation and for other lawful purposes.

**Liz Pulley**

---

**From:** Steve Lawrence <steve.lawrence@conservancy.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 06 March 2015 13:14  
**To:** Neighbourhood Planning; Valerie Dobson; Geoff Hand  
**Cc:** Richard Austin; Richard Craven; Linda Park  
**Subject:** Submission version Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan Submission Draft - CHC comments.docx

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Conservancy has no further comments to make regarding the amendments to SD1 and observations about whether a Strategic Environmental Appraisal was required for the Plan.

As with other NP's though, the Conservancy is disappointed that no summary table of responses has been produced and where changes were suggested any reasoning by the Parish Council as to why it was not appropriate to take these forward.

The Conservancy made its comments on 24 July 2014. Can you at least confirm those comments (re-attached for your ease of reference) – albeit a little late – were considered, as I see the Examiner was interested in the representations made?

Yours sincerely

Steve Lawrence MRTPI  
Planning Officer (Mon/Thurs/Fri)(Job share with Mrs Linda Park MRTPI)  
Chichester Harbour Conservancy  
Dell Quay Office, Dell Quay, Chichester, PO20 7EE  
01243 533 991  
[www.conservancy.co.uk](http://www.conservancy.co.uk)

---

Did you know there are lots of disabled access paths and facilities within Chichester Harbour? The *Solar Heritage*, our solar powered catamaran also has a wheelchair lift. For more information on access to the Harbour [click here](#).

*Confidential information may be contained in this email message and is intended only for use of the addressee. If you receive this email message by mistake, please notify [info@conservancy.co.uk](mailto:info@conservancy.co.uk) and delete this email, which must not be copied, distributed or disclosed to any other person.*

---

#### LEGAL DISCLAIMER

Communications on or through Chichester District Councils computer systems may be monitored or recorded to secure effective system operation and for other lawful purposes.

	<p>should be retained and enhanced. Lighting along this part of the site should be minimised.</p>
<p><b>Chichester Harbour Conservancy (001)</b></p>	<p>In overall terms the Conservancy supports the Submission Draft as a well thought-out and logically structured piece of work, supported by a good evidence base, with a strong vision.</p> <p>About half of the Plan area is outside of the AONB, but the Conservancy is pleased to see the recognition of issues of recreational disturbance from new development within 5.6km of the AONB/SPA boundary and how this is to be mitigated, in Policy SD 1, but this also needs to be stressed in SD 2.</p> <p>Two alterations are proposed to the existing defined settlement policy boundary ('saved' BE1/Policy 2 respectively from the Development Plan for Chichester District). These are outside the AONB and have no impact to its landscape setting, but would increase the potential for recreational disturbance to the Chichester Harbour SPA. With regards to Page 6 and H/2 in Appendix 1, it needs to be recognised that the emerging Policy H5 provides for a <u>minimum</u> of 50 new dwellings to meet Fishbourne's housing need up to 2029, not a maximum.</p> <p>It would be useful if SD 1 and SD 2 could say the site area in hectares and what the intended density is, so prospective developers can be clear on the community's expectations and interpretation of Policy 33 from the emerging Local Plan for Chichester District. Neither policy talks about the acceptability of flatted development, which of course could generate higher densities and still be visually appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted that the population density of the village is relatively high and that its population structure is well balanced.</p> <p>Whilst referring to lack of medical facilities it does mention the existence of Bosham Clinic: perhaps it might be better to refer to lack of NHS surgery facilities, just to be clear. If there is evidence to show a surgery could be supported, it may be better to allocate some land for that purpose as a potential exception to Policy ENV1, in respect of the identified 'Fishbourne Playing Field' site, which, being next to the Fishbourne Centre, would be a logical place to locate such a community facility and any car parking to the playing field/centre could then serve a dual purpose.</p> <p>A recognition of community safety aspects fits well with public bodies' duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. It is clear the main concern regarding safety is highway safety. This could have perhaps been better evidenced using accident statistics. The second paragraph on page 10 also refers to a County Highways Survey on traffic volumes. If that report</p>

	<p>is available, it would be good to cross reference it and summarise its findings in the Plan when it is eventually published following the community referendum. For page 11, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point under sub-heading of 'AREA 1', could 'downward asymmetric profiled' be added before the word 'lighting', to ensure that no unnecessary light spillage disturbs wildlife in the adjacent open countryside.</p> <p>It appears SD 3 is really more a statement than a Policy, which is perhaps better forming part of the written justification for SD1 and SD 2.</p> <p>For D1, the Policy would have more 'teeth' if you identified what it was about Fishbourne as a place which makes it distinctive. The approach for the Conservation Area Appraisal was to identify character areas and this may be a useful starting point to perhaps have as an Appendix and cross refer to that in D1. So, for example, you could analyse views in/out in each character area and then comment on things like density, building to plot ratios, set-backs from the street, scale, materials, negative features worthy of removal, etc., to give some parameters to the distinctiveness of each, which you were seeking to preserve, reinforce or enhance.</p> <p>The bullet point which reads "restricting houses to 2 storeys <u>where possible</u>" will have little meaning to a developer. It would perhaps be better to say something like – "development shall be of appropriate scale and massing, having regard to the surrounding context and wider views in the landscape", perhaps then referring to the character areas talked about above.</p> <p><u>Small typing errata:</u></p> <p>Page 13, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph up from bottom of page, should "...to integrate each development as part <u>as</u> the village..." instead read - "...to integrate each development as part <u>of</u> the village..."</p> <p>Page 22 - Should 'CLT' at the end of Policy E1 instead read CLP?</p>
<p><b>English Heritage (002)</b></p>	<p><b>Our Vision</b> English Heritage welcomes and supports the reference within "OUR VISION" to "conserving and enhancing the character of its historic fabric and environment".</p> <p><b>Page 4</b> English Heritage welcomes and supports the intention that the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan will enable the community to</p>